

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## THE COP-OUT MORATORIUM

## HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, most of the Nation's press has gone out of its way to present the October 15 moratorium as an event of great significance and importance for the cause of peace.

I do not believe that the moratorium did one thing to encourage the cause of peace. There was nothing in it which would encourage Hanoi to soften its demands or to bring it closer to the negotiating table.

However, the press attitude on the moratorium was by no means unanimous. The Columbia Record, the evening newspaper in Columbia, S.C., and one of the distinguished newspapers in our State, published a very sound analysis on the eve of the moratorium. The Columbia Record has a fine reputation for realistic analysis of national and international events and in its editorial entitled "The Cop-Out Moratorium," it does not fail its reputation. The Record says:

The strength of the "peace movement" in legislative halls and on big city streets, has already prolonged the war, seriously impaired the negotiative power of the U.S. and South Vietnamese governments and cast enduring doubt on the American will to fulfill written and verbal agreements to free people anywhere in the world.

The Columbia Record quite frankly points out the long-range prospects of the fall of South Vietnam to Communist control. The Record says that Europeans, for example, have said that Americans cannot be depended upon to defend Europe. And not only the defense of Europe would be put in doubt; our credibility in Japan, Indonesia, India, Pakistan, Australia, Latin America and any other country would be in great doubt. The Record says:

Watching the "peace" demonstrations tomorrow, they must—with great sadness—re-design their internal security plans, resurvey their military, diplomatic and economic arrangements with the rest of the world.

Mr. President, I regard this editorial as a major statement of opinion from South Carolina, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## THE "COP-OUT" MORATORIUM

The eyes of Washington and Hanoi will be fixed on the hundreds of places tomorrow where thousands of idealistic youngsters and elders will observe a "moratorium" on the Vietnam War. But there will be pragmatic watchmen in the towers of our nation as well, assessing the short-range and long-range effects of the unusual demonstration.

In the beginning, there can be no doubt about what the overwhelming majority of the participants want. It is not just "peace in Vietnam," an objective shared by President Nixon, but immediate and uncondi-

tional withdrawal of American troops—in brief, surrender.

The President desires "peace" as expeditiously as any of the protestors. That's neither the question nor the point. (Former Vice President Humphrey, acutely conscious of the position the U.S. is forced to occupy in today's world and of the complexities of Vietnam, has endorsed Mr. Nixon's peace program.) The question is (a) whether the U.S. will disengage with honor in Vietnam, or (b) withdraw immediately, dragging the red-white-and-blue colors in the sandy soil, dirtied, for the whole world to see.

Those who believe that a great power like the U.S. can blow the bugle, assemble its troops in airborne or seaborne carriers and bring them home unconditionally and immediately may well dwell in some euphoric land where all is unreal, where all men love "peace." They dream the dreams of a psychotic.

The strength of the "peace movement," in legislative halls and on big city streets, has already prolonged the war, seriously impaired the negotiative power of the U.S. and South Vietnamese governments and cast enduring doubt on the American will to fulfill written and verbal agreements to free people anywhere in the world.

Beyond the moratorium, what? A weakened U.S. posture in Paris, where Communist negotiators have rightly predicated their intransigence upon growth of the "peace movement" within this country. Based on their parlayings with the French and the decay in Paris, they have placed their bets well.

President Nixon's options have been considerably reduced; including the virtual elimination of any military redress to hasten a peace settlement. The sole remaining question is how much honor can the U.S. salvage when it comes home from Vietnam? Can it insure, as it has pledged, free determination by the South Vietnamese of their own government? Or will the U.S., and South Vietnam, be forced to accept a government that will be directly or indirectly Communist? Will the South Vietnamese people be forced to serve under totalitarian rulers and subjected to a bloodbath?

The long-range doubt is even more frightening. For a number of years, Charles de Gaulle of France spoke quite frankly to Europeans and said that Americans could NOT be depended upon to defend Europe. How right he might have been. Those who participate in the moratorium tomorrow either believe, or are inclined to believe, that the U.S. should withdraw to a Fortress America.

Berlin doesn't matter. Yugoslavia doesn't matter. Rumania doesn't matter. Nor France, Italy, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland, Belgium, the Netherlands, Britain. Should the Soviet ground forces roll, let 'em roll! What happens in Europe is none of our business.

Japan doesn't matter. Indonesia, India, Pakistan, Laos, Thailand, the Philippines, Australia.

Brazil doesn't matter. Nor Argentina, Chile, Uruguay, Panama, Ecuador, Peru—all of Central America, South America and the Caribbean.

Israel doesn't count. Why should we intervene in the affairs of the Middle East. Let Israel and the Arab states settle their own affairs. But, above all, don't get us involved! No more Vietnams!

Ethiopia doesn't matter. It's only a squiggly line on Africa—a whole mass of squiggly lines with names that don't concern us. Nigeria, Biafra, the Congo (and which is

which?), Rhodesia, South Africa, Liberia, Tanzania, etc.

What does matter? The continental United States. It is perhaps even true that two of the states, in the attitudes of the New Isolationists, can be written off. Hawaii is far, far off in the Pacific; and didn't we have a frightful Second World War that began at Pearl Harbor? And frigid Alaska, with its new-found oil, couldn't it really be written off?

Direct attack upon the continental U.S. itself might—just MIGHT—stir the New Isolationists to consider serious military action.

The foregoing thoughts are not ours alone; they are serious thoughts of serious men in the foreign ministries of the world, who must be concerned about the security of their own countries. Some possess written promises of the United States: they wonder, today, whether the words have any meaning whatsoever. Watching the "peace" demonstrations tomorrow, they must—with great sadness—re-design their internal security plans, resurvey their military, diplomatic and economic arrangements with the rest of the world. The United States, many will conclude in the language of the youngsters who demonstrate tomorrow, is "copping out."

## PLANNING METHOD FOR OUR WATER RESOURCES

## HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Paul Taylor of Berkeley is an expert in the field of the control, development, and utilization of water resources.

Dr. Taylor has, on numerous occasions, spoken out on the proper planning method for our water resources. The statement I am submitting for the RECORD was Dr. Taylor's statement before the Water Resources Council in September of this year. I am pleased to insert Dr. Taylor's comments in the RECORD at this point.

STATEMENT BY PAUL S. TAYLOR TO WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL

1. My name is Paul S. Taylor and I reside in Berkeley, California. Between 1943 and 1952 I served as consultant on water matters in the Department of the Interior, and have continued this interest ever since. This statement focussing primarily on western reclamation, represents my personal views.

2. Regrettably, administrators of water resource development overlook too easily the fact that the purpose of reclamation is "to benefit people, not land." The relevance today of these 1958 words of the Supreme Court is emphasized by the 1966 statement of Gilbert F. White, Chairman of the Committee on Water of the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences, pointing out that "the management of water resources has evolved to a stage where planning should center upon the needs of people rather than upon water per se. This viewpoint implies that a broad range of alternatives must be considered before a decision is made to develop a water resource. To deal effectively with the increasingly complex nature of the decision process, new institutional arrangements may be needed to take account of intangible as well as

tangible objectives." (Preface, Alternatives in water management.)

3. His Water Committee added explicitly: The effects of water decisions . . . have to do with the total net benefits to society regardless of who receives benefits or who is adversely affected. A different dimension, too long neglected as a matter of systematic analysis, has to do with the distribution of benefits among persons and among areas . . . there should be explicit consideration of the distributional effects of water decisions. (Ibid., 29)

4. The principles that people should benefit from development of water resources and that the benefits should be distributed widely among them are not new. They rest upon the historic foundations of the national conservation movement. The first Governors' Conference on Conservation declared in 1908:

"We agree that the sources of national wealth exist for the benefit of the People, and that monopoly thereof should not be tolerated." (Gifford Pinchot, Breaking New Ground, 351.)

5. It would be unnecessary to repeat these principles now, except that they are so largely unobserved in current practice. Reclamation is a prime example. The excess land provisions of reclamation law, the instrument for distributing benefits of water resources development widely among people, is honored mainly in the breach. A Secretary of the Interior confessed to Congress in 1964 that "both Congress and the executive branch have on occasion exhibited a degree of concern for the excess-land owner which may be difficult to reconcile with the policies embraced by the excess land laws." (Acreage limitation policy: study prepared by the Department of the Interior pursuant to a resolution of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 88 Cong., 2 sess., xiii.)

This confession—an understatement—has not been followed by visible improvement of administration by the Interior Department.

6. A first essential for return to the fundamental principles of conservation is the will to abide by them. Given the will, legal techniques are at hand for achievement of results in harmony with the principle that people shall benefit widely.

7. Present law requires landowners on reclamation projects to empower the Secretary of the Interior to sell their lands in excess of 160 acres at pre-water prices. We should empower the Secretary to buy these same excess lands. This has been recommended often, beginning with the Governor of Montana in the early nineties, followed by the famous Fact Finders Report of the Coolidge era, by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and California Labor Federation in the forties, and by the National AFL-CIO, Northern California Council of Churches and Sierra Club in the sixties.

8. Government purchase of excess lands would facilitate achievement of true public objectives for water development:

(a) Enforcement of reclamation law by providing owners of excess lands with a ready market.

(b) Publicly planned open spaces and agricultural greenbelts preserved from encroachment of suburban sprawl and slurb, through regulation of land use upon resale or lease.

(c) Assignment of incremental land value revenues arising from public investment in public resource development to public purposes, such as—

(1) "Water grants" for education, in the tradition of land grants for education.

(2) Enrichment of the National Conservation Fund.

(3) Enrichment of the National Treasury.

9. The Nation should discontinue policy and practices described by Major General Jackson Graham in these words:

"Is a man entitled to buy up, settle or promote a chunk of desert and then demand

that his government bring water to him from the general direction of the North Pole?" (Wildlife Management Institute, Outdoor News Bulletin, May 24, 1968, 2.)

## COMMUNIST CHINA: A POLITICAL ASSESSMENT

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, because there are so few calm, dispassionate examinations of Communist China these days, I am happy to recommend to Senators, and to all interested in the Peking regime, an article, entitled "Communist China: A Political Assessment," written by Dr. James T. Myers, of the University of South Carolina. The article appears in the booklet, entitled "Twenty Years of Tyranny: Communist China 1949-69," published by the Committee of One Million, on whose steering committee I serve.

Dr. Myers, who has authored a number of articles about Communist China and is fluent in Chinese, examines the record of Mao Tse-tung from October 1, 1949, to the present. He traces the euphoric early years, the growing disillusionment, the failure of the great leap forward, and the terror and anarchy produced by the great proletarian cultural revolution. Dr. Myers concludes:

The Maoists' grand schemes, such as the Great Leap Forward and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, have wreaked havoc with the political, economic and educational systems. The damage will require decades, at least, to repair. Any Chinese leader, of whatever political persuasion, will be faced with the necessity of devising practical political programs to deal with these problems. Despite the undeniable technical accomplishments, especially in the early years, one sees overall a record of squandered human resources and political resources of support both within the Party and without, which if not unprecedented, must still be recorded as gross political ineptitude or outright stupidity. China still needs today, as she needed in 1949, political leaders who are able to bring internal peace, stability and a measure of prosperity to this vast and potentially great nation and great people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks Dr. Myers' probing analysis, entitled "Communist China: A Political Assessment."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### COMMUNIST CHINA: A POLITICAL ASSESSMENT

(By Dr. James T. Myers)

#### THE EARLY YEARS

On October 1, 1949, Mao Tse-tung stood atop the ancient Gate of Heavenly Peace in Peking to proclaim the establishment of the Chinese People's Republic. This joyous occasion for the Communist leaders marked the end of a grim and prolonged struggle which had seen the Communist forces suffer many years of bitter defeat and adversity. The years prior to the war against Japan had indeed been hard and cruel. But the hard years had been years of building and consolidation of the Chinese Communist Party (CPC) as well, and had been capped by the

Red Army's stunning successes in the field against the legions of the Kuomintang.

If one could select a single phrase to represent the spirit of the first years of the Communist regime it would be "New China," the epithet used everywhere in place of the formal name of the new regime. The spirit of these first years was precisely the spirit of "new"; of sweeping away the old and advancing with giant strides into the future. When Chairman Mao made his famous statement at the ceremonies marking the founding of the new government, "Our nation will never again be an insulted nation. We have stood up!" or when he spoke in 1950 of the "founding of our new country," Chinese of a broad variety of political persuasions displayed pride in the resurgence of Chinese political power and a national unity which had eluded the suffering Chinese for over a century.

#### A "PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC"

Observers of the Chinese Communist movement in 1949 spoke of its vigor and dynamism and of the unity and dedication of the Chinese leadership. Nor was the leadership of the new government, in theory, to be exclusively in the hands of the Communist Party. As a "People's Republic" the country was to be ruled by a coalition of classes, represented on the new Chinese flag by the four small stars around the large star of the Communist Party. The Political Consultative Conference, convened at Peking in September, 1949, to serve as an interim legislative assembly, contained a great many persons representing non-Communist parties and organizations. It was the members of the "democratic united front" groups and other non-Communist elements who were expected to provide a large share of the technical and managerial expertise which the new regime would require.

As Chinese with nationalistic feelings, these "democratic personages" may have rejected much of the Marxist dogma and many elements of the Communist program for China as well. But they shared a common desire to see China restored to her former greatness and they saw the Communist revolution as the most likely vehicle then available for the achievement of their aims. Though they failed to share the ultimate goals of the Communist movement, if, indeed, they actually perceived the nature of these goals, they joined forces with the movement in the spirit of a joint venture for the future of China. Individual non-Communist intellectuals and other technical and managerial elites who stayed behind on the mainland or who returned there from other parts of the world, may or may not have liked the leadership and programs of the Chinese Communist Party, but they felt they could work with the Communists and were willing to put their trust in the Party for the task of building a new China.

Likewise the Party enjoyed the confidence of its own membership. 1949 marked the zenith of the power and the prestige of Party Chairman Mao Tse-tung and was, perhaps, the high water mark of Party unity, discipline, and shared confidence as well. The public documents of the early years reflect an apparent genuineness, an élan, the evidence of confidence that important new accomplishments lay just over the horizon. In addition, Communist China immediately gained a powerful ally in the Soviet Union. Though Communist China became the junior partner in a somewhat unequal relationship, her leaders clearly looked to the heartland of Marxism-Leninism for support, both spiritual and material.

It was with these considerable resources of faith, dedication and trust, then, that the leaders of the Chinese People's Republic embarked on the path of building a new socialist China.

Though trained and educated non-Communists were willing to join with the Communists in rebuilding mainland China, mere acquiescence or neutrality toward the regime



was not considered by the Party to be a sufficiently reliable political attitude. Mao Tse-tung's dictum that "neutrality is a camouflage" applied to internal politics as well. It was not enough that the non-Party elites were willing to go along with the plans of the new regime. Communist doctrine provides for temporary alliances with nationalist elements which serve a "progressive" role in bringing about the collapse of the old order. That doctrine does not, however, accept the nationalist goals of these elements, nor does it allow for a permanent alliance with them. Early in the life of the regime, therefore, non-Communist elites began to feel the pressure of conformity, a pressure fully backed by the coercive power of the state.

The "Suppress Counter-Revolutionaries Campaign" which began in 1951 marked the first organized attempt by the Communist leadership to bring leading non-Communist elements to heel. As Mu Fu-sheng observes:

"There can be little doubt that the Communists wanted to get rid of all leadership and prestige except that of the Communist Party, hence missionaries, heads of schools, great businessmen and anyone who commanded respect, were—whether innocent or guilty by the legal standards of the non-Communist world—charged, imprisoned, humiliated in public, and then expelled or 'liquidated'."<sup>1</sup>

This movement was followed in 1952 by the "Three Anti" and "Five Anti" campaigns. The "Three Anti" was directed primarily at non-Communists working in the government, although Party members were, to some extent, affected as well. The "Five Anti" was directed primarily at owners and executives of commercial and business enterprises which had not been completely taken over by the government.

Unable to withstand the pressure of the campaigns and finding it impossible to escape, many Chinese chose death by suicide. So numerous and widespread were the suicides, that it was rumored that people in the commercial center of Shanghai were afraid to go out of their houses lest they be hit by falling bodies. While the campaigns were theoretically directed at the two categories of persons described above, they were, in fact, as Mu Fu-sheng observes, used "to crush anyone the regime found objectionable, and charges, based upon mere suspicion and anonymous informers and supported by flimsy evidence, were brought against the enemies of the government."

Despite the brutality of the drives of the early 1950's, mainland China's leading non-Communist elements were not entirely liquidated. They were, however, clearly put on notice that the regime lacked no reluctance to use force and terror against them; a lesson they would not easily set aside when later offered the opportunity to voice their discontent.

#### THE HUNDRED FLOWERS AND THE GREAT LEAP FORWARD

The alienation and discontent of the educated non-Communist Chinese remained for the most part submerged in the several years following the terroristic drives of 1951-1953. Indeed, it appears that the Communist leaders believed that the "democratic personages" had been won over to the Party or at least to have come under the Party's sway and control. How gross a miscalculation this proved to be was revealed in the spring of 1957 when, for a few brief weeks, the Hundred Flowers blossomed forth.

The concern expressed throughout the Communist world, combined with the unrest in East Europe following Khrushchev's "de-

Stalinization" speech in February, 1956, prompted Peking to issue two long political statements in which, for the first time, Mao Tse-tung appeared to be making an attempt to assert his ideological leadership on an international scale. The implied message of these statements, penned in April and December, 1956, was that if the fraternal Parties had the wisdom to practice the Chinese Communist "style of leadership" and "method of work," their own internal affairs would suffer no serious disorders. Internally, at the same time, the Chinese Communists launched an attempt to allow for, indeed to encourage, greater intellectual dissent and debate. Although some analysts have seen the call for criticism as a trap to smoke out the remaining dissidents and malcontents among intellectual circles, the weight of the evidence would seem to indicate that the Communist leadership believed the intellectuals to be fully under control if not ideologically "re-molded" as well.

Throughout 1956 and the early months of 1957, the call for "100 flowers" to blossom and "100 schools of thought" to contend for acceptance met with only limited response. Cautious intellectuals, having earlier felt or seen exhibited the full coercive power of the state, displayed no eagerness to become martyrs to a hopeless cause. Only after several apparently genuine indications of the Party's desire for criticism did the bottled-up discontent pour forth in the spring of 1957. Instead of the mild criticism which the Party leaders hoped for and expected, however, the intellectuals responded with a torrent of abusive denunciation.

Members of the "democratic" parties complained that they were mere window dressing and that the coalition government was a sham. They denounced the Communist Party's monolithic structure and the arrogance with which the Party assumed responsibility for all important state decisions. Intellectuals in all areas of academic endeavor attacked the meddling and interference of Party cadres, claiming that academic matters should be handled by academic persons. In general the criticism of the Hundred Flowers period saw the omniscience of Chairman Mao questioned, and the Communist system and Party subjected to close inspection—and found wanting. The response of the Party was to institute yet another drive against the intellectuals—the "Anti-Rightist" campaign—in which the offending critics were either criticized; held up to public ridicule; scorned and ostracized by their frightened colleagues; "sent down" to the countryside (as a part of the *hsia-jang* or "downward placement" movement), or shot.

Although the Party had apparently squandered the tremendous reservoir of support available among non-Communist intellectual circles, the Party itself appeared to react to the criticism of the Hundred Flowers period with solidarity and singleness of purpose. Both the right and left wings of the Party joined to suppress criticism, the vast majority of which came from non-Communist elements. Later developments revealed, however, that the Party had already been suffering from serious internal strains and tensions by the summer of 1957—a condition rendered considerably worse by Mao Tse-tung's Great Leap Forward in 1958.

It is clear from material now available that throughout 1956 and part of 1957, a bitter and divisive debate developed within the top ranks of the Communist Party over the character and thrust of the second five-year plan, which was to begin in 1958. Party Chairman Mao Tse-tung sought to recast the entire economy, to achieve a Great Leap Forward by organizing the labor power of millions of human beings. Mao's Great Leap was eventually put into effect over what appears to have been substantial, although not decisive, opposition within the highest circles of the Party.

The Great Leap was, in almost every re-

spect, a complete failure, bringing not only a calamitous disruption of the Chinese economy but an increasing awareness among many top Chinese Communist leaders that Chairman Mao and the great "Thought of Mao Tse-tung" were inadequate to the task of leading Communist China along the path of national reconstruction and political stability. By the time the Central Committee of the Communist Party met in plenary session in December, 1958, the full extent of the Great Leap disaster was becoming apparent. Those who had opposed the scheme from the beginning, led by Minister of Defense Marshal P'eng Teh-huai, were joined by others who had supported the Great Leap with varying degrees of reluctance. A general retreat from the radical programs of the Great Leap was begun and, more importantly perhaps, Mao Tse-tung was forced to step down from his position as Chairman of the Government, though not relinquishing his post as Chairman of the Communist Party.

The partial demotion of Mao Tse-tung, however, apparently was not enough for Marshal P'eng and his supporters. They pressed their attempt to have Mao's hands removed completely from the reins of power. The matter came to a head in September, 1959, when the Party Central Committee met once again in plenary session. While the majority of the Party leaders were willing to oppose Mao's radical domestic social and economic policies, the person and image of Chairman Mao were too intimately wedded to the whole fabric of Communist rule in China to have the Great Helmsman held up to public abuse or ridicule. The settlement reached at this meeting, therefore, represented a rather unstable compromise.

Marshal P'eng and a number of his high-ranking associates lost their Army and Government posts, although they were not officially expelled from the Communist Party and Marshal Lin Piao, Mao's strongest supporter at the meeting, was installed as Minister of Defense. In turn, assurances appear to have been given that more sober minds would direct the affairs of state than under the stewardship of Chairman Mao. The task of undoing the failures of the Great Leap fell to Liu Shao-ch'i, second-ranking member of the Communist hierarchy and newly-installed Chairman of the Government.

Even though Mao Tse-tung was not personally subjected to public criticism or held up to ridicule, he left the September, 1959 meeting considerably reduced in power and influence. The Mao mystique had been shattered. The Great Helmsman was no longer viewed by the inner circle of Party leaders as omniscient and omnipotent, the leader who always arrived at the proper solution to difficult problems and who managed to maintain a unity of purpose and a consensus within his own leadership group. Moreover, the episode left the Party with divisions which, although papered over, would grow deeper and wider over the years which followed.

#### THE GLORIFICATION AND ABUSE OF CHAIRMAN MAO

In the six years following the September, 1969 plenary meeting of the Party Central Committee, two simultaneous developments accelerated the divisions within domestic political factions. First, Chairman Mao and his supporters intensified the campaign to glorify Mao and refurbish his tarnished image. Chief among the purveyors of the now-expanded Mao cult were Ch'en Po-ta, Mao's long-time ghostwriter and personal secretary, and Marshal Lin Piao (later to become famous as the author of "Long Live the Victory of People's War"), the then newly-installed Minister of Defense.

It became the task of Lin Piao to rebuild the shattered unity of the People's Liberation Army (PLA), which had resulted from the purges of P'eng Teh-huai and a number of

<sup>1</sup> Mu Fu-sheng, *The Wilted of the Hundred Flowers—The Chinese Intelligentsia Under Mao*, (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969), p. 142.

his high military associates. A principal element in the Lin strategy was the attempt to infuse the ranks of the PLA with a deep and thoroughgoing loyalty to the Party and to Chairman Mao. Given the serious damage which had been done to Mao's prestige and personal image by the failure of the Great Leap and subsequent attacks by the P'eng Teh-huai group, the glorification campaign assumed added importance. Mao's image and authority were central to the whole network of loyalties which the Communist Party had attempted to create since 1949.

The celebrations surrounding the tenth anniversary of the founding of the Chinese People's Republic, which followed the September plenary meeting by only one month, provided the first important opportunity for Lin Piao to reveal the thrust of the new campaign. In a major policy address, Lin affirmed the unconditional loyalty of the PLA to the Communist Party. Lin emphasized that the "predominant side" of military education must be the political side; that the PLA must "never forget politics" but must "emphasize politics," and that it was an army "in the service of politics."

The focus of Lin's campaign was further revealed in a collection of secret PLA documents.<sup>2</sup> The documents show the deep divisions and unrest in the ranks of the PLA as well as the extent of the campaign to politicize, reunify, and insure the loyalty of the armed forces. The attempt to build loyalty in the PLA received further impetus from campaigns to emulate army heroes who had displayed the proper level of devotion to the Party and Chairman Mao. The two earliest and perhaps best known of the heroes, who now number several score both living and dead, were Lie Feng and Wang Chieh (the latter being the famous "ever rust-proof screw"). Both died leaving diaries which showed them to have an unusually keen appreciation for and devotion to the thought of Chairman Mao. The diaries, which are marked by a rather obvious artificiality, should not be accepted at face value, but are illustrative of the type of model life which the PLA and eventually the rest of the Chinese were urged to emulate.

The propaganda surrounding the PLA heroes, especially the campaign to "emulate Comrade Wang Chieh," became an important element in the nationwide campaign to make the PLA and its personnel the models of proper Communist behavior for the entire country. The call rang out that "The Whole Country Must Learn From The PLA." A national conference of workers in commercial departments concluded that the working style of the PLA was "the basic attitude in perfecting commercial work." The young people of China were urged to "go all-out in learning from the PLA." In addition, political departments similar to those found in the PLA were established, first in industrial and communications ministries and later in other types of organizations, on the assumption that the "fundamental aspects of political work in the PLA were entirely applicable to the industrial and communications departments."

#### ADVANCE OF LIN PIAO

The thrust and purpose of these campaigns were closely related to the advance of Lin Piao's personal fortunes. Lin could scarcely fail to benefit from the growing position of prominence assumed by the PLA from 1960 onward. He could also expect to benefit from the fact that he was increasingly recognized as the person who correctly summed up and interpreted the thought of the Great Helmsman. That is not to say that

Lin was playing a calculating game to advance his own political position.

There is no reason to believe that prior to the onset of the violent phase of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution Lin failed to share the goals of Mao Tse-tung and his supporters, including (a) re-establishment of Party authority within the military; (b) elevation of the PLA as the model of Communist behavior; (c) purge of troublesome intellectuals in Peking; (d) general tightening of control in domestic policies, and finally, for Lin personally, (e) the possibility of securing the removal of some important and high-ranking potential rivals for leadership.

This latter consideration was undoubtedly of considerable importance to Lin if he had serious political ambitions. He could scarcely have hoped to displace Liu Shao-ch'i, Party General Secretary Teng Hsiao-p'ing, or Premier Chou En-lai, nor to advance his own position substantially by siding with the moderates or anti-Maoists in the intra-party struggle already under way. By casting his lot with Chairman Mao, by becoming, in fact, the principal pillar of Maoist support, he could hope to gain the inside track for the top position in China once Mao was gone.

While Lin Piao and other supporters of Mao Tse-tung pressed their campaigns on behalf of the Great Helmsman, other factions within the Party pursued entirely different goals. Under the administration of State Chairman Liu Shao-ch'i and Party General Secretary Ten Hsiao-p'ing, the programs and machinery of the Great Leap continued to be dismantled and a general de-radicalization in domestic affairs encouraged. Each attempt by the Maoist faction to re-introduce radical social or economic programs through the formal machinery of the Communist Party was either defeated or, if formally adopted, was handled by Party cadres who went through the motions and mouthed the proper slogans without giving the program any meaningful or substantive thrust. Indeed, the Maoist faction's growing reliance on the PLA as a vehicle to spread the Maoist-style revolution in Communist China in the early 1960's was in part dictated by their realization that the regular Party machinery had become thoroughly unreliable.

Nor was their belief in the unreliability of the Party machinery based entirely upon the Party's unwillingness to adopt radical domestic programs. Shortly after the close of the September, 1959 plenary meeting of the Party Central Committee, a subtle campaign pursued mainly through the literary devices of parable and satire was initiated to ridicule and discredit Mao Tse-tung personally. The two principal authors of the attacks, Ten T'o and Wu Han, were highly placed in the Communist Party hierarchy of the capital city of Peking. Wu Han was a prominent intellectual and Deputy Mayor of Peking. Teng T'o had been for six years, up to 1959, the editor-in-chief of the *People's Daily*, official news organ of the Party Central Committee, and subsequently held high posts in the Peking Municipal Committee and North China Bureau of the Communist Party.

The campaign came to light toward the end of 1965 when Wu Han came under fire as the author of an historical drama, "Hai Jui's Dismissal From Office." In this drama Hai Jui was presented as an upright official of the Ming Dynasty who fought for the interests of the peasants against the corrupt "retired Prime Minister" and his group. It was apparently clear to all who read this drama, as well as some prose pieces about Hai Jui also written by Wu Han, that Hai Jui represented the purged Minister of Defense P'eng Teh-huai, and that the corrupt "retired Prime Minister" was none other than Mao Tse-tung.

Perhaps the most abusive attack on Chairman Mao came in an article by Teng T'o

titled, "Special Treatment for Amnesia," which contained only thinly disguised references to Mao's rumored mental instability. The author advised hitting the patient over the head with a special club to induce a state of shock.

The fact that the latter essay was published in *Frontline*, the official fortnightly journal of the Peking Committee of the Communist Party of China, points up a fundamental dissimilarity with the attacks of the Hundred Flowers period. The attacks of Wu Han and Teng T'o were attacks from within the Party. Wu and Teng were Communist Party intellectuals, writing in official Party journals, largely for the consumption of other Party intellectuals.

Moreover, these publications were under the jurisdiction of P'eng Chen, a member of the ruling Politburo, Mayor of Peking, and First Secretary of the Communist Party's Peking Municipal Committee. P'eng Chen occupied positions of great strategic and political importance as head of the Peking Municipal Government and leader of the one and one-quarter million member Peking Party organization. As First Secretary of the Peking Party Committee, P'eng Chen directed the affairs of more than seven percent of the entire membership of the Communist Party.

#### THE PARTY UNDER SIEGE

By the fall of 1965, a serious crisis had developed in the top echelons of the Communist Party. A number of policies had gone wrong for the leadership, and several potential conflicts had come to a head by November, 1965. In early October there had been a breakdown of Sino-Indian relations and the destruction of the Peking-oriented Communist Party of Indonesia. There had also been a collapse of the Afro-Asian conference following Peking's failure to have the Soviet Union excluded from the meeting. The Sino-Soviet conflict, which had been growing in intensity since 1956 as a result of the arrogant, belligerent attitude of Chairman Mao and his followers, had reached a new level of hostility by November, 1965. Peking declared that the conflict between the CPC and the Soviet Communist Party had become an "irreconcilable antagonism."

Perhaps the most important single factor precipitating the open outbreak of hostilities may be found in the events surrounding a high-level meeting of the Chinese Communist Party in September and October, 1965. Available evidence indicates that Mao Tse-tung made several proposals at this meeting which were either rejected outright or accepted and then not put into effect.

In general the tide in domestic affairs was running against the Maoist faction as the more moderate views of anti-Maoist groups held sway. Moreover, the summer of 1965 had brought the extraordinary appointment of the purged Minister of Defense P'eng Teh-huai to the position of Third Deputy Director of the Control Commission of the Party's Southwest Bureau and the appointment of his former subordinate, Huang Ko-cheng, the purged Chief of the PLA General Staff, to a position as Vice Governor of Shansi Province. These events, combined with the fact that the Party authorities in Peking continued to assume a highly protective attitude toward Chairman Mao's literary critics, must have indicated to Mao and his supporters that a strong group at the top level of the Party hierarchy had determined to resist any new tightening up, or radicalization, in domestic policy.

Failing to have his proposals accepted, Chairman Mao retired from Peking sometime in November and disappeared from public view for six months. When he did return to Peking in July, 1966, it was on the heels of a lightning military takeover of the capital city by his chief supporter, Defense Minister Lin Piao.

The Mao forces, with the support of the

<sup>2</sup> The King Tso T'ung Hsun, (Work Bulletins [of the PLA], Translated in *The Politics of the Chinese Red Army*, J. Chester Cheng (Ed.), Hoover Institution Publications Stanford, California, 1966.



central military leadership, quickly purged imprisoned, or otherwise eliminated their opponents at the top level of the Party. The Maoists then turned their attention to the Party apparatus in the provinces which, in their view, had become totally unreliable. The revolutionary youth who had been cultivated over the years were organized into Red Guard units and dispatched to the provinces to take over, by force if necessary, errant Party organizations. They were to stage a total revolution in the Party and country—a Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. The Red Guard movement met with stiff resistance, however, from well entrenched power holders in the provinces and failed to achieve the aims of the Mao faction. Indeed, by accentuating the existing divisions in the Party, the excessive behavior of the Red Guard may have made the ultimate victory of the Maoists far more difficult.

In a very real sense, the story of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is the story of the ascendance of the military in Chinese Communist politics; a development treated elsewhere in these pages by a distinguished expert. It is, however, also the story of the destruction of the organized machinery of the Communist Party of China, the full magnitude of which is revealed in the statistics of the purges carried out over the last several years. The power vacuum into which the military has moved was caused by the removal of over forty of the ninety-three full members of the Party Central Committee known to be alive at the end of 1965—and the disappearance of a number of others.

Of the seventy-nine alternate members of the Central Committee, forty were purged. The purges also claimed three of the six First Secretaries of the Regional Bureaus of the Central Committee and twenty-one of the twenty-nine provincial First Party Secretaries. So complete has been the destruction of the party that, on the Provincial level, most Party headquarters were occupied by the army and the Party Committee ceased to exist as an operative unit.

Despite current attempts to rebuild the Party following the adoption of a new Party Constitution at the Ninth Congress of the CPC held in April, 1969, the military shows few signs of relinquishing the power it has inherited. At the provincial level, the "Revolutionary Committee" continues to be the relevant locus of political power, and the Revolutionary Committees continue to be dominated by the PLA. Should the Revolutionary Committees eventually develop into new subordinate committees of the Party, the likelihood exists that those presently holding power will simply continue to do so under new titles.

On the national level as well, the power of the PLA is evidenced by the unprecedented number of positions occupied by the military on the newly-elected ruling Politburo of the Communist Party. Therefore, while the Cultural Revolution has played havoc with the Communist Party and brought about the purge of a number of Chairman Mao's enemies, it has not resulted in the installation of units of government ready to respond eagerly to a Maoist call for the adoption of new radical social and economic programs.

#### ON THE EVE OF THE TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY

The Chinese People's Republic approaches its twentieth birthday in a condition which can only fairly be described as exceedingly unstable. Despite Mao's apparent victory over his opponents within the Party, the possibility of the development of independent regional bases of power by Provincial or Military Area Commanders of the PLA remains a threat to central leadership. There is yet no evidence that key commanders have exercised a very high degree of independence from the central political or military authorities, but there is equally little

evidence to suggest that they have been pushed to the point where they would be inclined to do so. Another potentially more serious problem is contained in the fact of the Maoist victory itself.

The political situation is bound to remain unstable as long as the Maoist inner circle can continue to manipulate Mao's image as a God-figure whose "Thought" forms the only reliable source of political wisdom, a source to which every one must at least pay lip service.

It is precisely the application of this "Thought" which brought forth the series of crises in recent Chinese Communist history. Indeed, it is strikingly incongruous that at the very time when the reputation of Mao's "Thought" has fallen to its lowest ebb in mainland China, when the Great Helmsman's revolutionary doctrine has been rejected by his life-long comrades-in-arms, this same doctrine has found widespread acceptance among radicals of various political colorations in the West.

The Maoists' grand schemes, such as the Great Leap Forward and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, have wreaked havoc with the political, economic and educational systems. The damage will require decades, at least, to repair. Any Chinese leader, of whatever political persuasion, will be faced with the necessity of devising practical political programs to deal with these problems. Despite the undeniable technical accomplishments, especially in the early years, one sees overall a record of squandered human resources and political resources of support both within the Party and without, which if not unprecedented, must still be recorded as gross political ineptitude or outright stupidity. China still needs today, as she needed in 1949, political leaders who are able to bring internal peace, stability and a measure of prosperity to this vast and potentially great nation and great people.

#### PRIZES FOR TORTURE

### HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a strongly worded letter of rightful anger and frustration from a constituent regarding the apparent popularity in junior and senior high school science classes for experimentation with birds and other small animals, these inept experiments usually result in death and suffering to the animal as the experimenter is frequently unskilled and lacks proper equipment to perform the surgery called for in the experiment.

It is equally apparent, Mr. Speaker, that the science contests sponsored by private and federally funded foundations are encouraging this cruel experimentation by offering prizes and trips to young persons engaging in this practice.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, to submit an article from the New York Times of May 10, 1969, and from the Friends of Animals "Action Line" for inclusion in the RECORD, which more fully explains this sad situation.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, May 10, 1969]

#### PRIZES FOR TORTURE

There is a growing fad among high school students to perform heart transplants, brain surgery and other radical experiments on

animals. Among youngsters interested in science, this desire to imitate the more spectacular work being done by mature professions on the far frontiers of science is understandable. But it is a desire that must be brought under control.

High school students are not usually skilled enough to perform these difficult operations. They frequently end by torturing the helpless monkey or bird or rabbit or inadvertently sending it to a slow, lingering death. Adult scientists doing medical research sometimes have to perform painful animal experiments, but youngsters who do these botched-up imitations are not advancing the cause of medical knowledge.

Unfortunately, many adult organizations thoughtlessly encourage high school students to perform these atrocious "experiments." Science fairs at the local, state and national level often award prizes to students whose only real achievement has been the deliberate or inadvertent torture of animals.

High school science teachers and national organizations can bring this unhealthy fad under control by refusing encouragement and prizes for bizarre and inappropriate biological projects.

[From Friends of Animals]

ARE THE SCHOOLS IN YOUR COMMUNITY TEACHING CHILDREN TO BE CRUEL IN THE NAME OF "SCIENCE"?

Investigate the schools in your area and find out what projects involving animals are part of the curriculum or are encouraged by circulating information on the Westinghouse Corporation's Science Service organization. If you discover that live animals are used in classrooms or children are encouraged to experiment on animals at home or to participate in "science" fairs, you will want to go all out to enlist local newspapers in publicizing the cruelties and in getting parents to squelch the projects. Your Congressmen should learn that you do not want your tax monies spent in educating children to be cruel or callous about animal suffering. And, you may decide not to buy Westinghouse products. If so, let them know in writing at 200 Park Avenue, NYC.

As an example of the cruelty which is taught by schools, the Federal Government's National Science Foundation and Westinghouse, we reprint a June 5, 1969 article written by William C. Epler, Editor of the Brewery Gulch Gazette, Bisbee, Arizona.

Cruelty to animals by teenaged youths under the guise of scientific inquiry has grown to serious proportions because money and free trips are offered as rewards.

For example, this March the Westinghouse Corporations gave \$250 and an expense paid five-day trip to Washington to a girl who blinded house sparrows by removing their eyeballs, starved a number of these blind birds for six days till some of them died, and subjected them to electric shock punishments if they were unable to find food in her maze. Her inspiration for these activities came from the National Science Foundation grant she received last summer enabling her to observe the blinding and testing of sparrows at the University of Texas. She hopes to get another grant.

National Science Foundation grants come from U.S. Government funds. Every taxpayer should have a voice in how this money is spent. Westinghouse Corporation funds are private, but if the Corporation is not taxed on the money it pays to Science Service, it is the taxpayer again who is subsidizing the cruelty.

Following are a few of the projects which won local science fairs and were displayed at the International Science Fair held May 6-9 in Fort Worth, Texas under the auspices of Science Service which also runs the Westinghouse competition.

A boy from Tennessee froze 10 mice and 36 hamsters by pouring liquid nitrogen over them and then tried to revive them. In child-like printing he struggled unsuccessfully with the English and spelling in his large signs. For example: "Procedure. 1. Specimens were securely immotivated (sic) in freezing jar. 2. The liquid nitrogen was quickly poured on them. 3. Reviving consisted of electrical shock in different manners. 4. Heat and electrified water brought about quicker recoveries. 5. Stimulants did not prevent death after recovery. Specimens lived from a few minutes to several hours." Under the heading "Hypothesis" another large sign read "Specimens may respond to right stimulant. 1. Electrical stimuli. 2. Chemical stimuli. 3. Infared (sic) treatment."

In short, this boy was rewarded for painfully freezing, painfully reviving and then watching the death agony of the small captive animals pompously described under the general heading, "The Effects of Suspended Animation and Recovery in Higher Mammals Induced by Cryogenical Methods."

A boy from Florida describes his two-year project thus: "The study involved the subjection of dogs and guinea pigs to anaphylactoid shock and anaphylactic shock, respectively." The photograph of a cowering dog, fearfully turning its head away from the person drawing blood from it, was displayed at the booth. In response to a question the youthful experimenter replied, "I use the dogs for my serum source, and I only do surgery on the dead dogs who don't survive the histamine shock." He does this at the Miami Heart Research Institute after school.

A boy from Jamaica, Long Island, performs his brain surgery at home, and he has been rewarded by trips to both Washington, D.C. (Westinghouse Science Talent Search) and Fort Worth, Texas (International Science Fair), Commissurotomy—dividing the brain—in mice is his specialty and though the animals usually die in this amateur surgeon's hands, his prize-winning project appears under the title "Psycho Biological Effects of Commissurotomy on Mice."

A boy from Mississippi calls his exhibit "Artificial Heart—A New Concept" and his extensive surgery on rabbits was shown in detail in photographs at his booth.

A Virginia youth placed rats in a viselike instrument and implanted electrodes in their brains.

Last year monkey experiments described in the enclosed reprint of an article by John Hillaby in *The New Scientist* involved the same type of cruelty—putting the animal's head in a stereotaxic instrument, drilling holes in its skull and implanting or trying to implant electrodes.

The cruelty and stupidity of his project on delicate squirrel monkeys was underlined by the post-mortem examination of a dying monkey displayed at the booth. The report of veterinary pathologists at Michigan State University showed the ignorant abuse and long suffering to which the animal had been subjected.

This year, Science Service was taking no chances on a similar demonstration of the false premises on which its promotion of cruel experiments by untrained youths is based. A new rule for the 1969 International Science Fair prohibited display of any live animal. But photographs and signs described even more projects inflicting pain, fear or death on animals than at last year's Fair. The cruelty continues to grow while Science Service continues to defend its ill-conceived program. Even abstracts were hard to find at the 1969 Fair, and every booth was defended with a big bar preventing the public from walking in as is normal at exhibits. Security guards patrolled the Fair—a curious way to advance science.

## WITHDRAWAL FROM VIETNAM

## HON. GEORGE MURPHY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, amidst the clamor of recent days from those who would seek to induce President Nixon to abandon South Vietnam, a thought-provoking editorial was published in the *San Diego Union* of October 9. It asks several important questions involved in the withdrawal and views as unthinkable, thoughts of an instant surrender.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Trust Must Rise Above Clamor," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

VIETNAM SURRENDER UNTHINKABLE—TRUTH MUST RISE ABOVE CLAMOR

Again there is a strong riptide of activity in the United States of America which seeks to induce President Nixon simply to abandon South Vietnam.

The riptide is visible in Congress where, individually and in small groups, legislators are urging a condemnation of the American commitment in Southeast Asia.

The riptide is also visible in the national agitation—professional or naive—for a demonstration Oct. 15 to force President Nixon to make a more firm but generally undefined commitment to retreat.

Amid the clamor of the clagues, there are some things that are evident and even more that are not—things that Americans would do well to keep in mind as they try to distill some truth from the confusion.

The first is that whatever the mistakes of the past, the United States cannot roll back the calendar in South Vietnam. We have to deal with the war on the basis of the present realities.

And we must, in seeking the truth, challenge the depth of thinking as well as the credentials of the experts, be they self-styled or real.

It is a truth and a reality that the United States is diminishing its Vietnam commitment at a rate deemed prudent by the person upon whose shoulders falls the responsibility for making the awesome judgment—the President of the United States.

What exactly do the critics of our current actions want? More rapid withdrawal? How rapid? Is open retreat their real object?

Do the critics of the war know whether it is possible to move our men home from Vietnam more rapidly simply from the standpoint of logistics?

Would those who favor pellmell withdrawal be willing to endorse the inevitable bloodbath in Southeast Asia that such a retreat would create?

Are those who urge our surrender in Vietnam prepared to accept the responsibility for its effect upon the hundreds of our young men being held prisoners by North Vietnam? Several already have been executed and Hanoi says it may "try" the remainder as war criminals.

Is the Greek chorus baying at the heels of the President prepared to face the worldwide implications of a United States' surrender?

The fact is they advocate nothing but the negative—get out. Has anybody heard acceptable positive programs from these self-styled experts to preserve the seedling of self determination in Vietnam and prevent

the writing of an ignominious, bloody chapter in our history?

We have not heard them.

All that we have heard so far is that if we vaporize the American presence in Vietnam immediately, somehow everything will turn out all right despite the obvious and imminent dangers. It will not.

Americans should view with suspicion the thought that there is an instant solution in instant surrender.

## FORCE ACCOUNT CONSTRUCTION DOES NOT MEAN IMPORTATION OF SCAB LABOR

## HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I wish to relate a recent incident in Montana in connection with Federal contracting that will not, I trust, become a pattern.

The Corps of Engineers is constructing Libby Dam in northwestern Montana under an international agreement with our Canadian neighbors. Incidental to the building of that dam is the construction of a small fish barrier dam at Young Creek.

The Young Creek Dam was advertised with invitation to bid on July 17. Bids were opened on August 7. The low bid was \$84,100. This compared with the Government estimate of \$44,802.

The Government decided—and properly so, from the record available to me—that the low bid was too high. There was some urgency attached to construction of this dam. Therefore, rather than readvertising, the Corps elected to build the dam by force account, that is, by direct Government hiring of labor. Here again—from the record available to me—it appears that the decision to go force account, rather than readvertise, was a reasonable choice.

However, I object to the fact that the corps—in going force account—bypassed the normal and logical sources of labor. They are the Montana Employment Service and the local unions.

Local union officials protested the corps action. The *Hungry Horse News*, the Pulitzer Prize-winning weekly published at Columbia Falls, Mont., reported the union objection in an article published on September 19.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

[From the *Hungry Horse News*, Friday, Sept. 19, 1969]

UNIONS PROTEST CORPS ACTION BUILDING DAM  
KALISPELL.—Northwest Montana Building and Construction Trades Council has announced a formal protest against the U.S. Corps of Engineers method of building the Young Creek Fish Barrier Dam.

This dam on Young Creek eight miles from Eureka is for protection of a hatchery that will be built.

The Corps of Engineers rejected bids from private contractors, and are building the dam through "force account."



James Wehr, president of the Northwest Montana Buildings and Construction Trades Council, said: "The situation is that the Corps of Engineers is bringing men in from outside this area to build the dam. These men are costing local men jobs, and we object."

Roger Blades, business manager of the Operating Engineers, added: "We wouldn't be too unhappy about the Corps building the dam, if they'd use local union help. The idea of their using non-union members—as far as we know—is something we can't tolerate."

There were two bids for the dam—\$84,000 by Harding and Sons, Sandy, Ore.; and \$111,000 by Mottner-McCutchen, Seattle. Engineers' estimate was \$44,802.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, James Wehr, president, and Perry S. Melton, secretary, of the Northwestern Montana Building and Construction Trades Council at Kalispell, strongly protested the corps action.

The Corps of Engineers, in its September 26 letter to Mr. Melton, said:

For future jobs under similar circumstances we will certainly check first with the local Montana State Employment Office to see whether they have qualified people available.

Mr. Melton, in his September 30 reply, suggested that "a similar check with craft labor unions in the area would prove beneficial to all concerned."

Mr. President, I thoroughly agree with Mr. Melton on that point.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letters to which I have referred and other pertinent correspondence.

There being no objection, the letters and correspondence were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Telegram]

KALISPELL, MONT.  
September 9, 1969.

LEE METCALF,  
U.S. Senate, Old Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Corps of Engineers constructing Young Creek fish barrier in connection with Libby Dam project at Libby, Mont. We violently protest the Corps doing this work. We feel that work of this nature should be performed by building and construction trades people. Your assistance in this matter will be appreciated.

JAMES WEHR,  
President, Northwestern Montana Building  
and Construction Trades Council.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,  
SEATTLE DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS,  
Washington, D.C., September 17, 1969.

Hon. LEE METCALF,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: This letter is in further response to your recent letter to General Frederick J. Clarke, Chief of Engineers, which inclosed a telegram from Mr. James Wehr, Kalispell, Montana, concerning the construction of Young Creek fish barrier in Libby, Montana.

The Young Creek fish barrier dam is being constructed as a part of a pilot program to evaluate fish production potential in tributaries of the Kootenai River to offset fish losses in the river resulting from the construction of Libby Dam. Creation of Libby Reservoir will reduce the production of game fish in 48 miles of the Kootenai River within the United States. Libby Dam will prevent movement of game fish into this river reach from downstream areas. Loss of production

in the reservoir may be partially offset by achieving maximum production of game fish in streams tributary to the reservoir. Development of suitable fish production in tributaries would require habitat improvement to increase productive potential and construction of a barrier dam to exclude the large numbers of non-game fish that are expected to be present in the reservoir. A pilot program to evaluate the feasibility of developing fish production in tributaries was proposed by Montana Department of Fish and Game and agreed to by the Corps of Engineers. A three-year contract was executed in July 1969 between the Seattle District and the Department of Fish and Game to evaluate this proposed method. Young Creek, a west bank tributary of the Kootenai River near the Canadian border, was selected as the trial stream. The barrier dam is an essential facility in this evaluation. Montana has employed a fishery scientist and assembled the material to proceed with the evaluation.

All reservoirs are biologically most productive during the early years after impoundment. High productivity decreases rapidly during the first 5 to 10 years. Establishment of desirable fish stocks must be accomplished during this period of high productivity. Completion of the pilot program on Young Creek will provide firm direction for essential development of suitable game fish production to mitigate game fish losses in the Kootenai River. Early completion of the barrier dam is essential to the pilot program.

Our policy for construction of this type is to perform the work by contract with competitive bidding. The Young Creek fish barrier dam was advertised with invitation to bid on 17 July 1969. Bids were received and opened at 2:00 p.m. 7 August 1969. The low bid was \$84,100 compared to the Government estimate of \$44,802. After evaluation of bids, it was obvious that the low bid could not be accepted in light of the Government estimate. There was not sufficient time to re-advertise and award a contract that could be completed before 15 October, which is about as far into the winter as satisfactory working conditions can be expected to prevail. Accordingly, it was decided to accomplish the construction by Government-hired labor and an expedited work plan was started.

The urgency of completing the fish barrier facility this fall is related to the fish mitigation program for the Libby Reservoir. If the project is not functional next spring, the fish production evaluation program will be set back one full year. The importance of production of game fish to the State of Montana could not be overlooked.

It is hoped that the information provided herein meets your requirements. If there are further questions, please feel free to contact this office.

Sincerely yours,  
R. E. McCONNELL,  
Colonel.

NORTHWEST MONTANA BUILDING  
AND CONSTRUCTION TRADES COUNCIL,  
Kalispell, Mont., September 19, 1969.

Mr. ANTHONY MIELE,  
Labor Relations Officer, Department of the  
Army, Seattle District, Corps of Engineers,  
Seattle, Wash.

DEAR SIR: This letter is to support and verify other contacts and communications we understand you have recently received from spokesmen for craft unions affiliated with the Northwest Montana Building and Construction Trades Council concerning the method of construction of Young's Creek Dam, as part of development of a fisheries pilot program for the Libby Dam project.

To us it is unethical, to say the least, for the Corps of Engineers to have publicly advertised for and considered bids for the Young's Creek Dam, rejected the bids received and, without again calling for bids,

gone ahead with the job by directly employing workmen without regard to availability of local area qualified workmen and in disregard of well known established relationship with labor unions maintained by contractors on all other phases of the Libby Dam project.

While it may legally be the prerogative of the Corps of Engineers to follow a procedure such as above outlined, we wish to have it understood that we intend to pursue a course of opposition to such procedure through all available channels. We take this position on the premise that the Corps, or any other agency of government, has no moral right to, in essence, put itself in a position of open competition to tax paying employers and employees who customarily make their living in the construction industry and particularly those residing in the immediate area of work contemplated and/or in progress.

We herewith request that reconsideration be given to the policy being pursued on the Young's Creek Dam and request that your office promptly bring this letter to the attention of officials who can expedite such reconsideration.

Thank you for giving this matter your attention. We await your reply.

Very truly yours,  
PERRY S. MELTON,  
Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,  
SEATTLE DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS,  
Seattle, Wash., September 26, 1969.  
Mr. PERRY S. MELTON,  
Secretary, Northwest Montana Building and  
Construction Council, Kalispell, Mont.

DEAR MR. MELTON: This is in reply to your letter of 19 September 1969 regarding the construction of Young's Creek Dam by the Corps of Engineers. Please be advised that we made the decision to proceed to complete the job by hired labor methods for reasons most beneficial to the public interest. Our agreement with the Montana Department of Fish and Game was to complete the job by 15 October 1969, and there was not enough time to re-advertise in order to get the job done by that date.

The Corps of Engineers does not wish to compete with contractors in the construction field. However, we intend to discharge our responsibility to protect the public interest and must reserve the right to make such decisions under certain circumstances, as in the case of Young's Creek Dam. For future jobs under similar circumstances we will certainly check first with the local Montana State Employment Office to see whether they have qualified people available.

If there are further questions, please feel free to contact this office.

Sincerely yours,  
H. W. MUNSON,  
Major.

KALISPELL, MONT.,  
September 30, 1969.

Maj. H. W. MUNSON,  
Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers,  
Seattle, Wash.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your letter of September 26 in reply to ours of September 19 relating to construction of Young's Creek Dam. We note that you stress the viewpoint of "benefit" to and "protection" of the "public interest" as justification for the procedure used by the Corps of Engineers and refer to your "agreement with the Montana Department of Fish and Game to complete the job by October 15, 1969" as being of paramount importance.

We would remind you that the "public interest" is made up of many more segments of our democratic society than the Corps of Engineers and the Fish and Game Department. No small part of public interest is ex-

emplified by ordinary working people and the organizations they maintain to protect their welfare, i.e. labor unions, among others.

Therefore if, in truth, you seek to protect and benefit the public interest, we suggest that, in any matters involving jobs for working people, you extend such people the courtesy of being consulted prior to, and not after, making decisions ostensibly in their best interests.

If those working people have the skills necessary to build Libby Dam, and obviously they have, then they quite probably could have made a contribution toward more readily resolving the Young's Creek Dam difficulty. On the other hand some thought should have been given to the possibility of legitimate protest from these people in less mild form than letter writing, etc.

We favorably note your expressed intention that "for future jobs under similar circumstances we will certainly check first with the local Montana State Employment Service to see whether they have qualified people available." We suggest that a similar check with craft labor unions in the area would prove beneficial to all concerned.

Respectfully yours,

PERRY S. MELTON,  
Secretary, Northwest Montana Building  
and Construction Trades Council.

#### PENDING LEGISLATION ON CAMPUS DISORDERS

#### HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Federal Legislation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York recently completed a very thorough study and analysis of legislative proposals dealing with campus disorders.

The work of this committee deserves the attention of all Members of Congress, and I include in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the full text of the report: PENDING LEGISLATION ON CAMPUS DISORDERS (By the Committee on Federal Legislation)

#### INTRODUCTION

Widespread campus disorders during recent years have led to the introduction in the present session of Congress of more than twenty bills which would use the termination of federal aid to schools, students and faculty members as a means of control. The spectacle of student sit-ins, strikes and protests has become a common part of every newspaper reader's picture of contemporary America. Regardless of the underlying causes, these events have caused deep concern in many quarters.

Despite the justifiable concern, however, responsible studies, such as that made by the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, have concluded by cautioning against federal legislation in this area.<sup>1</sup> This view has been seconded by most educators and other persons familiar with campus problems. Our review of this legislation has led us to similar conclusions. In our opinion the proposed federal legislation, particularly since it relies on termination of federal aid as a sanction, would be self-defeating. We urge Congress not to enact any of the bills now before it which rely on such sanctions.

#### FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Since the current bills rely heavily on the use of federal aid to influence rebellious students, we will begin with a survey of the

federal programs which supply aid to education. Prior to World War II, there were few legislative evidences of congressional interest in the field of education. The Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890, the creation of the Department of Education in 1867, the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, and various emergency relief measures adopted during the depression years represented the significant federal aid to education developments before the Second World War.<sup>2</sup>

Since World War II, Congress has undertaken a number of broad range programs in the field of higher education. These include programs: to provide loans, federal scholarship aid, loan insurance, including subsidies on interest for needy students, to educate veterans, to lend colleges and universities funds for construction of dormitories and academic facilities, and to make grants and loans for pure and applied research and to assist in the education of science and mathematics teachers.<sup>3</sup> In 1954, the federal government spent approximately 160 million dollars in support of higher education activities. By 1965, the amount had grown to three and one-half billion dollars.

Federal aid has come to influence almost all aspects of academic life. Many students have become dependent on it. At the same time there has been little federal interference with the traditional prerogatives of local governments and private institutions and little federal effort to exercise general regulatory powers over higher education. Indeed, in enacting the program designed to assist schools, students and teachers, Congress clearly indicated that it did not intend to have legislative controls accompany federal aid because such controls would be inconsistent with the purposes underlying the enactments.<sup>4</sup>

#### CAMPUS UNREST 1964-69

The first major disorder affecting American college campuses in recent years occurred at the Berkeley campus of the University of California in 1964.<sup>5</sup> Between 1964 and 1968, campus discontent grew throughout the country, and confrontations between students and school officials took place at other campuses. During the 1967-1968 school year alone, more than 100 demonstrations occurred on college campuses.<sup>6</sup>

The number and intensity of campus disorders increased during the 1968-1969 school year. Most involved the seizure of buildings and some degree of violence.

In an effort to understand the causes giving rise to campus disorders, numerous groups and individuals have made in-depth studies of the subject. The National Commission on Violence concluded that "there is no single cause, no single solution" and that the problem of campus unrest has its roots "deep in the larger society."<sup>7</sup> The studies that have been made indicate that Vietnam originally served as one of the focal points for student dissent and that "it is still a major source of alienation and dissatisfaction with our society and our national government."<sup>8</sup> The National Commission on Violence found that a problem coupled with Vietnam is that of the draft. Students "face the prospect of being compelled to fight in a war most of them believe is unjustified" and they live in constant uncertainty as to when the course of their lives may be interrupted by the draft.<sup>9</sup>

The studies reveal that unrest exists not only as a result of the conduct of the war itself, but also because of the relationship of the war to domestic problems which are considered urgent and which many students feel should have priority. "Students see us spend billions on armaments while poverty and ignorance continue at home."<sup>10</sup> The National Commission on Violence observed that "today's intelligent, idealistic students see a nation which has achieved the physical abil-

ity to provide food, shelter and education for all, but has not yet devised social institutions that do so. They see a society, built on the principle that all men are created equal, that has not yet assured equal opportunity in life."<sup>11</sup>

The National Commission on Violence found that not all the causes of student unrest are external. "There are undoubtedly internal emotional pressures and internal value conflicts in many students which contribute to their own dissatisfaction and thus to the tension and turmoil of campus life." The Commission noted that students have directed this pressure, in part, at the university because they see it "as an engine for powering the reform of the larger society, and as the first institution they are in a position to reform."<sup>12</sup> Some students view the university as a corporate bureaucracy suppressing their individuality.<sup>13</sup> Many "feel unable to communicate with administrators and faculty" and believe that "no adequate channel is open to them to make their views known."<sup>14</sup>

As to the degree to which students disorders may be centrally organized and coordinated, Attorney General Mitchell has stated that "it would be an oversimplification to blame all of the trouble on campuses today on the SDS."<sup>15</sup> He also said that "many disorders have occurred in which its members have not been present. . . ." The Brock Report states that the "problem is far deeper and far more urgent than most realize, and that it goes far beyond the efforts of organized revolutionaries."<sup>16</sup>

#### THE 1968 LEGISLATION

In response to campus disorders, Congress in 1968 passed four measures designed to cut off federal aid to students under various circumstances,<sup>17</sup> and one that would cut off aid to entire institutions.<sup>18</sup> While there was widespread sentiment in favor of condemning the student protesters, there was less agreement as to precisely how that disapproval should be expressed. As a result, the measures that passed in 1968 differ with one another in certain respects. For instance, the acts vary as to the grounds necessary for termination of aid to students. Three require a criminal conviction, while a fourth requires a finding of a serious violation of a school regulation which contributed to disruption.<sup>19</sup> Two acts place the burden of administration on the school and offer the student a hearing, while two others place the burden of administration on the funding agency and provide no hearing for the student.<sup>20</sup> Perhaps, at least in part, because of these differences, not one student had had his scholarship or loan terminated under the 1968 legislation as of February 1969.<sup>21</sup>

#### SUMMARY OF CURRENT PROPOSALS

One group of proposals would require the Commissioner of Education to terminate federal aid to any institution that experienced a campus disorder and failed "to take appropriate corrective measures forthwith."<sup>22</sup> These proposals provide for the restoration of aid upon the determination by the Commissioner that the disorder has ended and the institution had adopted a plan which, in his judgment, "provides reasonable assurances that such disorders or similar disorders, will not recur." These proposals also require the Commissioner to terminate assistance to teachers who "participate" in campus disorders.

A bill introduced by Congresswoman Edith Green and other representatives (H.R. 11941) contains two major proposals. As originally written, Title I would require colleges and universities to file with the Commissioner of Education a plan of action, including penalties, for dealing with campus disorders. Schools refusing to file such plans would have all their federal funds terminated. Title II would amend a 1968 law to allow schools to terminate for a period "up to

Footnotes at end of article.



five years" federal aid to students who are convicted of crimes as a result of engaging in campus disorders or are found by the school to have violated "a lawful regulation or order of such institution and that such refusal was of a serious nature and contributed to a substantial disruption of the administration of such institution."<sup>23</sup> The bill would extend the cutoff provision to students receiving aid under the G.I. bills and the children's allowance section of the Social Security Act. The proposal also would require students and faculty members applying for federal aid to file an affidavit attesting to their involvement, if any, with respect to campus disorders. In committee, Title I of H.R. 11941 was amended to delete the filing requirement so that schools would only have to develop a plan and have it available upon request.<sup>24</sup>

Another group of bills would terminate aid to institutions that attempt to minimize certain aspects of their cooperation with the Defense Department. Some would terminate funds to a school that either terminates or refuses to give credit to ROTC programs.<sup>25</sup> others, to schools that refuse to undertake research designated as important to national security;<sup>26</sup> and still others, to schools which fail to provide a reasonable opportunity for the Armed Forces, government agencies, or any defense contractor to recruit on campus.<sup>27</sup>

A few proposals are directed at individuals rather than institutions. Four appropriation measures which contain provisions designed to deal with campus disorders are presently pending in the Congress. The appropriations measures for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare (H.R. 13111) bars funds from individuals who, on or after October 12, 1968, have "engaged in conduct . . . which involves the use of (or the assistance to others in the use of) force or the threat of force or the seizure of property under the control of an institution of higher education, to require or prevent the availability of certain curriculum, or to prevent" persons "from engaging in their duties or pursuing their studies at such institution. . . ." <sup>28</sup> The bill further provides that it shall not apply to a particular individual until the institution at which the conduct occurred has had an opportunity to "initiate or has completed such proceedings as it deems appropriate but which are not dilatory in order to determine whether such individual was involved in such conduct." Similar provisions appear in an appropriations bill for the Departments of State, Justice and Commerce, the Judiciary, and other agencies (H.R. 12964), with the further requirement that institutions must certify their compliance with such provisions.<sup>29</sup> The appropriations bill for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration forbids the payment of funds to individuals who wilfully refuse to obey a lawful regulation or order of an institution and such refusal is of a serious nature and contributes to the disruption of the administration of such institution; and to individuals convicted of "inciting, promoting, or carrying on a riot or . . . of any group activity resulting in material damage to property, or injury to persons. . . ." <sup>30</sup> The appropriations bill for the Department of Housing and Urban Development contains a provision that no funds shall be paid to an institution which is not in full compliance with the 1968 Amendments to Section 504 of the Higher Education Act of 1965.<sup>31</sup>

#### EVALUATION OF CURRENT PROPOSALS

##### General

With respect to the need for additional legislation, there is a substantial body of opinion that legislation is not the proper vehicle for solving problems of campus unrest.

In its statement on campus disorders, the National Commission on Violence stated:

"We are equally disturbed, however, by the direction of much public reaction to campus unrest. Those who would punish colleges and universities by reducing financial support, by passing restrictive legislation, or by political intervention in the affairs of educational institutions, may unwittingly be helping the very radical minority of students whose objective is to destroy our present institutions of higher education.

"More than seven million young Americans are enrolled in the nation's colleges and universities; the vast majority neither participate in nor sympathize with campus violence.

"If aid is withdrawn from even a few students in a manner that the campus views as unjust, the result may be to radicalize a much larger number by convincing them that existing governmental institutions are as inhumane as the revolutionaries claim.

"If the law unjustly forces the university to cut off financial aid or to expel a student, the university as well may come under widespread campus condemnation."

Similar views were expressed by the 22 Representatives who visited many of the nation's campuses to talk informally with students, faculty, administrators, and other officials regarding the problem of campus unrest:

"Perhaps our most important and pressing conclusion is that rash legislative action cutting off funds to entire institutions because of the actions of a minority of students would play directly into the hands of these hardcore revolutionaries. Legislation which treats innocent and guilty alike inadvertently confirms extremist charges that the 'establishment' is repressive and indifferent to citizen needs and concerns. We must not put ourselves in the position of aiding the handful of anarchists.

"In our opinion, the fundamental responsibility for order and conduct on the campus lies with the university community."

In his testimony before a Special Subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee, Attorney General Mitchell said:

"Since most illegal activity on college campuses is in violation of state and local laws—such as trespass, illegal entry, assault and malicious destruction of property—I believe that current Federal laws are adequate. I therefore do not recommend to Congress that additional legislation be enacted at this time."

In contrast, there is little, if any, evidence which shows that additional legislation would be effective. The fact that as of February 1969 not one student had had his scholarship or loan terminated under the 1968 legislation suggests that legislation of the kind presently under consideration in Congress is unworkable and ineffective. Moreover, if, as reported, many of those leading campus unrest are not aid recipients, the proposed legislation would be almost totally ineffective in dealing with the problem.<sup>34</sup>

We consider it unwise for the federal government to interfere with and be responsible for discipline on our nation's campuses. The problems of campus disorder can best be dealt with by leaving it to school authorities to adopt, in accordance with their own processes and on their own initiative, such programs and plans as they deem appropriate for preventing and dealing with campus disorders. In this regard, it is significant that schools throughout the country have already undertaken reforms and have adopted plans which deal with disorders and define student rights and responsibilities.<sup>35</sup>

We do not believe that schools need any additional tools for dealing with campus disorders, including the power to terminate aid to individuals who participate in campus disorders. Schools have effective tools to enforce their traditional rights to discipline

students to the extent of expulsion, and to discipline teachers to the extent of dismissal.

It bears repeating that from the inception of our nation to the present time, it has been a fundamental principle that the effective functioning of the educational processes at American schools rests with the schools themselves. As the federal government's financial assistance to educational institutions has increased, the Congress has repeatedly recognized the wisdom of this principle and has affirmed that it does not intend to attach controls to its financial assistance.<sup>36</sup> Congressmen of both parties and of both liberal and conservative persuasion, in committee reports and in debate, have emphasized that education is a local responsibility and that the administration of the proposed programs would be the basic responsibility of the institutions themselves and of local authorities. These positions have been sound; we see no reason to reverse them.

#### Termination of aid to institutions

We regard as most inappropriate and unwise those proposals that would cut off federal aid to schools which (i) experience disorders and fail to take forthwith appropriate corrective measures, (ii) fail to adopt plans of action for dealing with disorders, and (iii) fail to withhold federal benefits from individuals involved in such disorders. One of the main defects in these proposals is that termination of aid to entire institutions could irreparably undermine the educational process and would affect every teacher and student at such schools regardless of individual participation. There can be no justification for legislation which operates to penalize the vast majority of the school population, particularly persons who have not been involved in campus disorders.

By automatically terminating aid to an institution which has experienced any kind of substantially disruptive disorder, regardless of the circumstances, H.R. 10136 may well be so sweeping as to interfere with the first amendment rights of free speech and peaceful assembly.<sup>37</sup> The Supreme Court made it clear in *Sherbert v. Verner*, 374 U.S. 405 (1963) that "conditions upon public benefits cannot be sustained if they so operate, whatever their purpose, so as to inhibit or deter the exercise of First Amendment freedoms." <sup>38</sup> As H.R. 10136 stands, it could deter faculty and students from engaging in various protected activities for fear that their conduct will be interpreted as a type of "other disorder" causing "substantial disruption." For example, a faculty member or student might refrain from addressing a campus group as to what he feels is the propriety and necessity of civil disobedience or revolt on the campus for fear that any active response by his listeners may be interpreted as constituting or causing a substantially disruptive disorder. Members of campus communities may be wary of engaging in peaceful demonstrations which include such protected activities as orderly marching and peaceful picketing out of concern that this activity might be considered an illegal "disorder." Students might be reluctant to join organizations which are politically active on campus so as not to add strength to an organization that had the potential to create substantial disruptions of campus activities.

The requirement contained in H.R. 11941 that funds be cut off from institutions that have failed to develop plans for dealing with campus disorders could penalize schools that have never had any disorders. These comprise the great majority of schools. It may well be that a particular institution can best deal with the problem of disorders without formalizing a plan of action. Yet under this proposal institutions could be denied this discretion because of the sanction of losing federal aid.

Footnotes at end of article.

In general, we believe that these proposals would constitute an unwarranted intrusion into the internal affairs of educational institutions.

#### Termination of aid to individuals

Proposals that would cut off aid to individuals rather than institutions are also subject to objection.

First, they would penalize only those students who receive financial aid and teachers whose salaries are paid from federal funds. Affluent students would be able to ignore the penalty while poor students would be vitally affected by it. These proposals may well result in such ludicrous situations as students slightly involved in campus disorders being punished, while those primarily responsible for such disorders receive no effective penalty; or of teachers equally involved in a disorder being treated differently, depending on whether or not their salaries are derived from federal funds.

Second, while most of the proposals vest the responsibility of terminating aid in the schools themselves, schools are granted no discretion as to the penalty. They would have to terminate aid to individuals once the conditions set forth in the legislation had been met. In our view, schools must be afforded flexibility in dealing with campus disorders in the light of their own judgment and experience and under the circumstances of each case. Discipline for a certain type of activity may be appropriate in one case and not in another. These proposals, however, would curtail this flexibility.

Third, a number of the proposals run contrary to basic notions of fairness. They fail to provide any right to a hearing for an affected student or faculty member or to require a criminal conviction or violation of a university rule as a condition precedent to the denial of aid. For example, the riders to the appropriation bills for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, Labor and Health, Education and Welfare provide that no aid shall be withheld until the institution at which the conduct occurred has had an opportunity to initiate or complete such proceedings as it deems appropriate but "which are not dilatory. . . ." Under this provision a school might "deem" no hearing appropriate. Moreover, if a school were dilatory in completing a proceeding, the provision would seem to require that aid be cut off to individuals before they have even been adjudged guilty.

Fourth, the riders to the appropriation bills for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, Labor and Health, Education and Welfare are plainly deficient in their requirement that the sanction applies to individuals who have engaged in the prohibited conduct on or after October 12, 1968. This would impose punishment retroactively. While October 12, 1968, is the date of the adoption of the amendments to Section 504 of the Higher Education Act, those amendments applied only to students convicted of certain crimes or found guilty of violating a university rule or regulation. As noted, the appropriation bills do not require a conviction or disciplinary action as a condition precedent to cutting off aid, and they would apply to teachers as well as students.

Fifth, if Congress should decide to adopt legislation providing for the termination of aid to students and teachers, we believe that legislation should be embodied in a single bill and not in the form of riders to various appropriation measures. The appropriation measures which have passed the House of Representatives and are pending in the Senate differ with one another as well as with the 1968 Amendments to Section 504 of the Higher Education Act of 1965. If these bills are adopted in their present form, these differences are likely to pose serious problems of interpretation and administration for both governmental and school authorities. For instance, under Section 504 funds can

not be withheld without a hearing and not then if there has been no "conviction" or violation of a university rule or regulation. However, under H.R. 13111 and H.R. 12964 there are no similar requirements. Thus, in some circumstances schools might find themselves required to make two determinations with respect to the same student. In addition, Section 504 would disallow benefits for a two year period while H.R. 13111 and H.R. 12964 would terminate aid permanently. It is unclear whether Section 504, the authorization act, would take precedence over the provisions contained in the appropriation measures.

#### CONCLUSION

We believe that the proposed federal legislation involving the use of termination of federal aid to schools, students and faculty members is one of the worst possible responses at this time to campus disorders. Not only might it have the effect of encouraging campus unrest but it could undermine the painstaking efforts now being made by schools and local groups to deal with the problem. In our opinion, campus disorders may best be dealt with under each school's own disciplinary procedures and under state and local law. Accordingly, we disapprove and recommend against passage of the proposed legislation.

Respectfully submitted.

August 7, 1969.

Eastman Birkett, Chairman; Thomas L. Bryan, John F. Cannon, Harvey P. Dale, Nanette Dembitz, Ambrose Doskow, John D. Feerick, Robert L. Friedman, Robert J. Geniesse, Louis Henkin, Robert M. Kaufman, Kenneth J. Kwit, and David Levitan.

Jerome Lewine, Arthur Liman, Jerome Lipper, John Lowenthal, James H. Lundquist, Edward A. Miller, Gerald Oscar, Alan Palwick, Leonard B. Sand, Myra Schubert, Leon Tykulska, and Irving Younger.

THE COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL LEGISLATION  
OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF THE  
CITY OF NEW YORK

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Following Robert Kennedy's assassination, President Johnson appointed a National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence (herein referred to as the National Commission on Violence). On June 9, 1969 the Commission issued the text of a statement on campus disorders. The New York Times, June 10, 1969, at 30, cols 1-8.

<sup>2</sup> Congress and the Nation, 1945-1964, p. 1196 (Washington: Congressional Quarterly Service, 1965).

<sup>3</sup> The legislative enactments in the post-World War II period establishing higher education programs include the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. § 1001 et seq.), Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 (20 U.S.C. § 701 et seq.), National Defense Education Act of 1958 (20 U.S.C. § 401 et seq.), National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. § 1871 et seq.), and the Housing Act of 1950.

<sup>4</sup> Thus, it was stated in the report of the House Education and Labor Committee accompanying the HDEA of 1958 that the proposed legislation sought to preserve the fundamental principle that education . . . is a state and local responsibility" and that the administration of the proposed programs would be the "basic responsibility" of the "state and institutions of higher education." H. Rep. No. 2157 (1958). See infra note 36. Section 803(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. § 1144(a)) specifically states:

"Nothing contained in this chapter shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution, or over the selec-

tion of library resources by any educational institution."

<sup>5</sup> Congressional Quarterly Fact Sheet "On Student Aid Restrictions," 2 (1968) [hereinafter cited as CQ FACT SHEET]. Students were protesting campus restrictions on political activities in what has become known as the Berkeley "Free Speech" Movement. Id.

<sup>6</sup> See CQ Fact Sheet, at 2.

<sup>7</sup> The New York Times, June 10, 1969, at 30, col. 1. See "Crisis at Columbia," Report of the Fact-Finding Commission Appointed to Investigate the Disturbances at Columbia University (Cox Commission Report); R. Kennedy, To Seek A Newer World 3 (1967).

<sup>8</sup> Report on "Campus Unrest" submitted to the President on June 17, 1969, by twenty-two House Republicans, at 24 [hereinafter cited as Brock Report]. Twenty-two House Republicans organized by Congressman William E. Brock made a private tour of college and university campuses. When they returned, President Nixon asked them to submit a report of their findings. See Cong. Q. Weekly Report 1066 (June 20, 1969).

<sup>9</sup> The New York Times, June 10, 1969, at 30, col. 2.

<sup>10</sup> R. Kennedy, supra note 7, at 5.

<sup>11</sup> The New York Times, June 10, 1969, at 30, cols. 1-2.

<sup>12</sup> The New York Times, June 10, 1969, at 30, col. 2.

<sup>13</sup> R. Kennedy, supra note 7, at 8.

<sup>14</sup> Brock Report, at 6.

<sup>15</sup> Testimony of Attorney General John N. Mitchell given before the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives on May 20, 1969.

<sup>16</sup> Brock Report, at 1.

<sup>17</sup> Provisions for terminating aid to students appeared in the following legislation: (1) the authorization law for programs under the Higher Education Act (PL 90-575); (2) the funding law for Higher Education programs (PL 90-557); (3) the appropriations law for the Department of Defense (PL 90-580); and (4) the appropriations law for the National Science Foundation (PL 90-550).

<sup>18</sup> The authorization law for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) provided for the withholding of NASA funds from any school whose administrative policy bars recruiting on campus by the armed forces (PL 90-373).

<sup>19</sup> Higher Education authorization law, the Higher Education funding law; and the Defense Department Appropriations law provided for convictions. See supra note 17.

<sup>20</sup> The Higher Education authorization law and the NSF appropriations law provided for hearings and placed the burden of administration on the schools themselves. The Higher Education funding law and the Defense Department appropriations law did not so provide. The burden of administering the provisions of the NASA funding bill as to entire institutions was vested in the funding agency.

<sup>21</sup> The New York Times, Feb. 16, 1969, at 1, col. 5.

<sup>22</sup> E.g., H.R. 10136, H.R. 10074, H.R. 10806, H.R. 10821, H.R. 10848, H.R. 10895, H.R. 10929, H.R. 10970, H.R. 11010, H.R. 11018, H.R. 11029, H.R. 11065, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. (1969). See also S. 2055, H.R. 11491, H.R. 11658, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. (1969).

<sup>23</sup> The 1968 law in question was the authorization law for programs under the Higher Education Act (PL 90-575), which provided for a two-year cut off period.

<sup>24</sup> On July 1, 1969, the House Committee on Education and Labor rejected Title I, as amended, by a vote of 19 to 16. The Committee also voted, 18 to 17, to send the entire proposal back to subcommittee. The New York Times, July 2, 1969, p. 1.

<sup>25</sup> E.g., S. 2111, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. (1969).

<sup>26</sup> E.g., H.R. 10849, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. (1969).

<sup>27</sup> E.g., S. 2049, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. (1969).



<sup>28</sup> This measure passed the House of Representatives on July 31, 1968. A rider was stricken from the bill providing for the termination of aid to institutions which failed to cut off funds to students or faculty members who had engaged in the described conduct (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 21653, July 31, 1969).

<sup>29</sup> This proposal passed the House of Representatives on July 24, 1969.

<sup>30</sup> H.R. 11271, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. (1969). This proposal passed the House on June 10, 1969. The Senate version does not include the section on campus disorders.

<sup>31</sup> H.R. 12307, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. (1969). This bill passed the House on June 24, 1969. The 1968 law (hereafter referred to as the 1968 Amendments) amended Section 504 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide that funds must be withheld for two years from students who are convicted of a crime or disobey a lawful regulation or order of their school, resulting in substantial disruption of the school. The Second Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1969 (PL 91-47), which was approved on July 22, 1969, provides that funds for annual interest grants authorized by section 306 of the Higher Education Facilities Act shall not be used by HEW "to formulate or carry out any grant to any institution of higher education unless such institution is in full compliance with section 504 of such Act."

<sup>32</sup> The New York Times, June 10, 1969, at 30, cols. 1 and 8.

<sup>33</sup> Brock Report, at 3-28.

<sup>34</sup> See, e.g., the testimony of Dr. Helen R. Bedesem, Director of Financial Aid, San Francisco State College, given before the Special Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor on February 3, 1969.

<sup>35</sup> See The New York Times, August 21, 1969, p. 28, cols. 4-8.

<sup>36</sup> E.g., the preamble to the National Defense Education Act of 1958 provides that, "The Congress reaffirms the principle and declares that the States and local communities have and must retain control over and primary responsibility for public education. The national interest requires, however, that the Federal Government give assistance to education for programs which are important to our defense." See *supra* note 4.

<sup>37</sup> The operative language of the bill provides:

"The Commission of Education shall forthwith suspend financial assistance (by way of grant, loan, or contract) under the provisions of law referred to in subsection (b) to any institution of higher education at which, by reason of violent demonstrations, riots, seizure of institution property, or other disorders, there is a substantial disruption of the administration of the institution, or students, teachers, or officials are prevented from pursuing their studies or duties and the administrative officials of such institution fail to take appropriate corrective measures forthwith."

<sup>38</sup> See also *Spelser v. Randall*, 357 U.S. 513 (1958); Note, "Unconstitutional Conditions," 117 U. Pa. L. Rev. 144 (1968).

## TAX REFORM

### HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. Willis Stone has presented an interesting proposal to the Senate Finance Committee which is pertinent to the Senate tax reform hearings. As national chairman of the Liberty Amendment Committee of the U.S.A., Mr. Stone represents

the viewpoint of a substantial number of our citizens. These citizens have done a considerable amount of research in the area of tax reform and their views deserve to be recognized.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement by Mr. Stone be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF WILLIS E. STONE, OCTOBER 3, 1969

As a matter of identification, I am Willis E. Stone, National Chairman of the Liberty Amendment Committee with headquarters at 6413 Franklin Avenue, Los Angeles, California. I speak for all the members, supporters and friends of the Liberty amendment, pending before the Congress as House Joint Resolution #23. They are organized in every state in the Union and more than 700 counties. Members of more than 7,000 other organizations have adopted resolutions of support for it, and seven states have formally petitioned the Congress to submit this question of public policy to the American people for decision. I speak with their knowledge, consent and support. I make that distinction to differentiate my testimony from that which may be given by those who speak in the name of organizations without the knowledge, consent or support of their membership.

Many long years have passed since a vast segment of the American people last had an opportunity to express their views that true tax reform and constitutional liberty are the same things and can only be had through the literal enforcement of the Constitution of the United States. These fundamental truths have gone unheeded, and the cumulative disasters visited upon the American people are largely traceable to the fact that violations of Constitutional principles continue to accelerate at ever increasing cost to the taxpayers.

The tax reform hearings being held by this Committee were impelled by the growing clamor of aggravated and frustrated taxpayers. These hearings implied a purpose of heading off, rather than increasing the tide of taxing and spending, which are the inseparable parts of the same things. The American people now find themselves in a political and economic straight-jacket of terrifying magnitude. They earnestly beseech you to actually seek true tax reform before your tax levies strangle the productive impulses of the goose that provides the plunder. I believe each of you agree there is monumental evidence to support this plea for real tax reform. As the great Al Smith so often said: "Let's look at the record."

The Statistical Abstract of the United States tells us the federal "tax and spend" spiral took a terrible toll in the 1950's. A resentful people provided the impelling motive for the tax reform hearings of 1958.

Consider the magnitude of the pressures involved. Individual tax collections by 1950 had risen to the staggering figure of \$18.4 billion—almost twice the cost of government for the first hundred years of this nation. The restraints and limitations upon the use and abuse of power appeared to have been broken. The anguish and concern of a great people made it quite necessary to call the 1958 "tax reform hearings."

Unfortunately, the effects of these hearings, insofar as can be observed, were more detrimental than beneficial to the people. The tax and spend philosophy was stepped up rather than diminished—as is evident by the fact that federal individual income tax collection in 1960 reached \$39.5 billion, more than doubling in the ten-year interval. This is indeed tax reform in reverse. But, we didn't know the half of it then, did we?

By 1963, the product of the 1958 "Tax Reform Hearings" should have been operative, yet individual income tax collections skyrocketed another 25 percent to \$48.2 billion that year. The idea began to emerge that there has been no validity in Congressional declarations of tax reform or equity.

This opinion was further supported by the accelerating tax demands put upon the people, drying up incentives to produce, as federal individual income taxes increased nearly half again over 1963 during the next five years, reaching the fantastic figure of \$68.7 billion for 1968, with a projected individual income tax collection of \$90.4 billion for 1970! No wonder the spirit of rebellion is loose in the land.

Despite this accelerating tax take from a reluctant people, there appears to be no pretense of keeping spending within income. The national debt is skyrocketing steadily toward the point of national bankruptcy. Referring again to the Statistical Abstract, the recorded federal debt in 1950 was \$257.4 billion. It climbed to \$276.3 billion by 1958. The debt went right on up to \$290.8 billion in 1960—and on up to \$310.8 billion in 1965—and on up to \$369.7 billion in 1968.

There is no indication that this is the end of the road you gentlemen are traveling, because you recently approved an increase in the so-called "tax ceiling" of \$12 billion.

It is worth noting in this connection that in 1968 your tax levies managed to take more money from the American people than any nation in history ever extracted from its people, yet Congress managed to spend \$25.4 billion more than was taken in, adding that much to an already crushing debt. Neither is it considered a coincidence that this money was borrowed at the highest rate of interest this nation ever paid which tends to reflect a lack of public confidence in government's fiscal integrity. Confidence in your fiscal and Constitutional integrity can be re-established by this Committee if you honestly propose taxation solely to finance the constitutionally authorized functions of government—finance them adequately—while at the same time withdrawing funds from the multitude of activities carried on by bureaucratic agencies without the slightest pretense of Constitutional authority.

There is no mystery about the agencies involved in these unauthorized functions, nor in the volume of plunder they extract from our people to sustain their interest free, rent free and tax free empires in direct and ruthless competition with tax paying enterprises. Neither is there any mystery about the corruption and waste of these specially privileged enterprises which are immune from law—local, state and federal.

The Hoover Commission's Report of 1955 revealed countless ways of instituting tax reform. We augmented that study with our own and have listed more than 700 federal agencies involved in these unauthorized activities. A copy of this list is handed to each of you herewith. To make very sure that it is beyond dispute in this Committee or elsewhere, there is, following every agency named on the list, a number, a symbol and another number providing official reference that qualifies each agency for a place on that list.

The appearance of a named agency on that list only stipulates that in some way that agency has exceeded constitutional limitations and invaded the private areas of activity which were, by the design of the Constitution, prohibited to government. The fact of that intended prohibition is clearly established by the 9th Amendment which provides that: "The enumeration of the Constitution of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

The founding fathers attempted to make doubly sure of this limitation upon your powers by the terms of the 10th Amendment

which provides that "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Despite these safeguards, however, we have this vast array of federal agencies' operating powers which were never delegated to government by the people, and exercising rights not enumerated.

The great dilemma of our time is your quest for revenue with which to maintain these illicit empires, which have already taken over forty percent of the land area and an estimated twenty percent of the industrial capacity of this nation without any Constitutional authority for doing so.

The people yearn for tax reform—true tax reform—and pray that you at long last will take steps designed to provide it by simply stopping the financing of these lands and enterprises which exist without constitutional authority. Adequate evidence exists to indicate that fully half of the federal revenue each year finds its way, through your appropriations, to the maintenance and growth of these unauthorized activities. This is an amount greater each year than the total amount of federal individual income taxes collected.

Your own reports show that, even in war, the civil functions of the federal bureaucracy demand and get greater increases in appropriations each year than the true military expenditures for national defense.

At the 1958 Tax Reform Hearings in the House of Representatives, I presented a summation of a highly objective analysis of the projected budget spending under the 1959 budget which was then before you. It was ignored, but the subsequent developments have confirmed every factor therein. I again present this summation, together with a comparable summation of the potential savings under the 1967 budget, showing a very similar pattern. Because of the ultra conservative basis of these computations it is doubtful that any overstatement will be found therein.

I am certain each of you know of these gigantic potentials for true tax reform. You may not agree in all details but you can not successfully contest the facts because they are too evident for denial.

There are, as you well know, hundreds of ludicrous but tragic examples of bureaucratic incompetence. There was the abortive political effort to raise Abaca in Central America, and the more disastrous political idea of mining low grade nickel in Cuba. There is the continuing program of compelling American farmers not to produce sugar which, as a side result, sentenced Cuban farmers to a life-time of peonage to tyrants there. There was the ridiculous Eskimo House the program—only slightly more ridiculous than the rest of the housing programs spawned here in Washington at the cost of countless billions of American tax dollars, and resolving nothing.

There is the thoroughly silly story of the steam-heated railroad tunnel in Alaska, and the bureaucratic effort to corner the world's tin supply which ended in disaster for us, and produced the turmoil in Bolivia that ended in a Communist take-over of that unhappy land. There is also the current mania for financing a road through Asia which the U.S. Army Engineers are building at our expense for our Communist enemies.

There is an endless variety of such amazing and unauthorized dissipation of the productive energies of the American people—your people. They want it stopped. It is the first necessity for producing true tax reform on the heroic scale that will glorify you, our nation and our people for centuries to come. It can be done by just living according to our Constitution. Vast numbers of people, all across this broad land, are gathering in support of the Liberty Amendment, which is de-

signed as the best possible instrument for restoring the Constitution to full force and effect, and compelling government to live within its organic law.

It is a tragic commentary that the people are coming to believe it necessary to forcibly apply the principles of the Liberty Amendment to reapply the rule of law upon those who represent us in government. It would be much more to the point, and infinitely more desirable in every way, if you, our leaders in government, would approach the great problem of tax reform from this traditional and truly basic viewpoint. The tremendous problems which confront you will rapidly diminish if you do this, and stop the insane spiral of spending by our bureaucratic empire builders.

What does the future hold? By the arbitrary imposition of the tax and spend philosophy which has destroyed countless nations, we can go deeper into the morass of tumult, conflict, rioting, burning, right into the agony of revolution in the eternal struggle of power and plunder. I am sure all of us want to prevent that.

Our people prayerfully hope that your Committee will find the way, in these tax reform hearings, to restore the tranquillity and equity of just and equal law under the Constitution. We pray you will finance only constitutionally authorized functions of government, leaving all else to the sovereign states and the free people of this great land.

How can we reach your ears, your minds, your hearts, and inform you, our leaders, regarding the will of the American people, and inspire you to the task of repairing the sanctuary of the Constitution as the only safeguard to our lives, liberties and property. Surely, the stark, silent but immutable message of the public will to be free of oppressive governmental taxing and spending has long been evident to those who will listen. We pray that you hear these truths, and heed them, and bring about that "rebirth of freedom" for which your people yearn.

#### POSTAL REFORM

### HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon declared in his recent address to the Congress:

We intend to begin a decade of government reform such as this nation has not witnessed in half a century.

The House has before it several proposals which represent initial steps in this direction.

One of the most important, in my judgment, is the President's proposal for total reform of the U.S. Post Office.

That proposal—H.R. 11750—has been stalled in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee by a tie vote on whether to report the measure.

Although it is clear to me that the American public strongly supports this measure, it is apparent the strong special interests which oppose this bill have prevailed in this committee action.

Mr. Speaker, if this is any indication of how the Congress is going to respond to the awesome challenge of making our National Government more workable for the last third of the 20th century, then I submit our Nation is in for a serious crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I am gravely concerned that this action may prevent meaningful postal reform. I urge that the committee reconsider its vote, and permit the Congress to act upon the public mandate for action in the important area of postal reform.

#### ESCALATOR FOR SOCIAL SECURITY

### HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's proposal for a 10-percent hike in social security benefits and the automatic escalator provision to compensate for inflation offers a permanent, equitable solution to serious problems which have plagued this system since its enactment.

Unfortunately, much of the criticism of the President's proposal which has been heard recently in this body must be classified as an attempt at "political one-upsmanship," designed not to help those on social security, but merely to further the partisan interests of the critics.

A recent editorial in the Los Angeles Times discusses the benefits which will result from removing this system from "biennial politics," and urges adoption of the President's proposal. I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

#### ESCALATOR FOR SOCIAL SECURITY

Issue: Why should we not provide, as Mr. Nixon suggests, for automatic boosts in Social Security as living costs rise?

Congress should give early and favorable consideration to President Nixon's proposal for enactment of an escalator clause which would automatically boost Social Security benefits as the cost of living goes up.

The President, recognizing that inflation has cut painfully into the purchasing power of those who are dependent upon Social Security checks, has recommended a 10% hike in benefits.

Democratic leaders on Capitol Hill, not unmindful that millions of old people will be voting in next year's congressional elections, having gone on record in favor of a larger, 15% boost.

Mr. Nixon is quite correct in concluding that the time has come to stop this kind of political one-upsmanship, which has been almost a biennial event ever since the Social Security program was enacted in the 1930s.

The 10% hike which he proposes would be enough to cover the inflation which has occurred since the last increase in benefits in early 1968. It would take effect next April.

After that date, there would be an automatic adjustment once a year in order to reflect increases in the consumer price index. Specific congressional action would no longer be required.

The major attraction of the President's proposal is one of equity. It would write into law the principle that Social Security beneficiaries will not be victimized by runaway inflation.

Beyond that, of course, the automatic escalator provision would, as Mr. Nixon observed last Friday, "do much to remove this system from biennial politics."

Actually, the automatic escalator concept is not new. It has long been proposed by Republican study groups in Congress, and it was specifically endorsed by President



Nixon in a campaign speech last September. The idea also has been supported in past Times editorials.

It has not, unfortunately, developed the same backing among Democrats.

Aside from the proposed boost in benefits, an attractive feature of the Administration's Social Security plan is the proposal that retirees be allowed to earn up to \$1,800, instead of the present limit of \$1,680, without any diminution of Social Security benefits.

Earnings in excess of \$1,800 also would be treated more liberally than at present.

In considering this recommendation, however, the responsible congressional committees must carefully weigh its effect on the job market—and on the already high level of Social Security payroll deductions.

#### DEMONSTRATION, LARGELY FUTILE

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday's moratorium apparently was many things to many people.

To those, such as the New York Times, who wanted it to be a success, it was a success. To others it was less of a success. To some it was an exercise in futility.

That point of view was best expressed by the Scripps-Howard papers of last Thursday, which I now insert in the RECORD:

#### DEMONSTRATION, LARGELY FUTILE

[From the Scripps-Howard Papers, Oct 16, 1969]

If it had been altogether an objective demonstration in behalf of worldwide peace, the so-called "moratorium" of yesterday would have been symbolic of the paramount hope of all peoples—and in that sense perhaps even useful.

If the demonstration had been wholly motivated and designed as evidence of the overwhelming American desire for a respectable end to the war in Vietnam and American determination to bring this about at the earliest moment, it could have been a stimulating and effective exercise.

If the demonstration had been arranged and conducted primarily to impress Hanoi and Moscow and Peking, rather than the demonstrators themselves and possibly Washington, it might have been a beneficial operation.

As it turned out, it was none of these things. As a practical matter, it largely was an energetic exhibition of futility. Many of the politicians who joined in did so chiefly as opportunists, or to embarrass the Nixon Administration for partisan reasons. Many people doubtless took part from an honest but vague belief that their participation somehow would end the war. A few simply were egotists enjoying the display of their own images.

All of these diverse groups, of course were linked in this movement to the radical, pro-Hanoi elements which have been a basic sparkplug in many of these outbursts.

It is because of these disruptive elements, if for no other reason, that the demonstrations quite plainly served much more to spur on the North Vietnamese aggressors rather than encouraging them to negotiate a reasonable settlement of the conflict.

Some of the "moratorium" speakers to the contrary, there is no sentiment in this country favoring war. Nobody yearns for war. Regardless of the strategic wisdom (or lack of

it) in sending U.S. troops to Vietnam, the purpose was not simply to engage in armed conflict, but to resist an unprovoked, deliberate attempt to subvert and subjugate a relatively defenseless people. Our judgment, from the standpoint of self-interest, may be questioned—but not our motives.

Few in this country question the right to dissent, or the privilege of dramatizing the right of petition, both of which were exercised so lavishly yesterday. But the judgments and motives of the dissenters and demonstrators may be questioned—that is another precious right still extant in this country, we hope.

In this light, it seems clear that the "moratorium" was characterized by more blindness than vision. More important, the net of it is likely to be wasteful divisiveness at a time when solidarity is crucial. It is a shame that so much energy could not have been expended in a more constructive manner.

#### TO THE VETERANS' BELLE

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the story of a true belle for all veterans who has given her volunteer services to our Reno, Nev., Veterans' Hospital. Her 9 years of unselfish dedication to our former fighting men will not go unnoticed.

The story follows:

#### "TINKERBELL" WELL KNOWN AROUND VETERANS HOSPITAL (By Susan Mathes)

A small figure walks down the hospital corridor dressed in blouse and slacks. On her tennis shoes she wears two tiny bells that jingle, letting patients know of her approach. She is well-known to many patients of the Veterans Hospital as "Tinkerbell."

A volunteer worker for the Veterans Administration, Miss Maxine Emily Brown has contributed more than 13,000 hours in the nine years she has been with the VA.

When asked why she decided to become a volunteer worker, Miss Brown said, "I had newspapers on the floor for my cats and saw an article asking for volunteer workers for the Veterans Hospital. I've been here ever since."

"When I first started working for this voluntary program, I was despondent," Miss Brown continued. "I have no children. But you quit feeling sorry for yourself when you see others worse off than you."

"They (the patients) have helped me as much as I have helped them," she said.

Mr. Kenneth Lucht, VA Voluntary Services Director, said of Maxine, "She takes a deep personal interest in the hospital as a whole, and the patients in general."

Miss Brown's duties include escorting patients from room to room, helping them eat, running errands for patients and nurses, and finally, working in those areas most closely related to the patients.

Miss Brown also makes artistic posters in correlation with hospital activities, and helps in patient reception.

She likes to make the patients laugh. "The first or second time they meet you they just look; but once they know you're sincere, they start liking you," she said.

Miss Brown recalled an incident that happened to her at the hospital a few years ago prior to a back operation.

"I received cards from the Veterans Hospital with 198 signatures. The card had been

signed by patients, nurses and doctors of the Veterans Hospital. It gave me one of my biggest boosts," she said.

Miss Brown is one of 90 regularly-scheduled volunteers and is not affiliated with any organization.

In addition to receiving a special pin for her many hours of voluntary service from the VA, Miss Brown also received a Senior Citizen's Award (although she is not a member) commending her on her outstanding service to the hospital.

Miss Brown, 53, was born in Digne, France, but has spent most of her life in the United States.

VA Director Charles Lappin said "My praise of Maxine can't be high enough. She is a woman dedicated to the serving of others."

#### NO EXIT FROM VIETNAM

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, in the body of this RECORD, I stated my view that policymakers in the executive and every Member of the Congress should read Sir Robert Thompson's new book, "No Exit From Vietnam." To encourage the largest number to read the whole of this book, I include its final provocative chapter:

#### CHAPTER XIII—No EXIT

It is interesting to speculate what President Nixon might have been able to do if President Johnson had stood firm on the reciprocity issue until the end of his term of office and had made it abundantly clear that, although he would have liked to achieve peace, he was not prepared to make concessions which suggested the possibility of a sell-out. In these circumstances the new President would have been in a much stronger position. My own view as to his course of action would have been that, with the full agreement of his allies, he should have announced an immediate bombing halt without requiring or even discussing any reciprocal action on the part of Hanoi. Everyone would have known that, coming from him, this did not presage a sell-out. It would have put Hanoi in an awkward position. She would have had to reciprocate in some precise manner to show good faith and negotiations proper would have had to follow immediately. Procedural questions and the agenda could then have been thrashed out leading perhaps to a broadened conference or, if considered likely to be more fruitful, still confined to the two major parties. All the time there would be hanging over Hanoi's head the threat that the bombing might be resumed with greater force and greater justification. This threat (and the threat is more compelling than the act) is now denied to the new President because it has become almost impossible for him to resume the bombing when he lacks the credit for having stopped it. Moreover, no one has been told whether or not Hanoi made any concessions and, if so, what they were. She can hardly, therefore, be accused of breaking them and has indeed secured an unconditional halt to the bombing. While this did not alter the options available to the United States, it did weaken her hand in a situation of fighting while negotiating.

There were by the end of 1968 only two apparent options, both unpleasant, facing the new American President—either to end the war, by deliberately selling out or by allowing himself to be pressured into a camouflaged sell-out and so leaving the

South Vietnamese to their fate, or to develop a long haul low cost strategy as the only acceptable alternative and as a means of countering a return to protracted war on the part of Hanoi.

A negotiated settlement, as a means of obtaining an 'honourable' peace, was not an option because Hanoi would agree neither to a cease-fire nor to any compromise settlement which did not guarantee an eventual take-over of the South. Mme. Nguyen Thi Binh, the leader of the NLF delegation made the first quite clear on her arrival in Paris, when, in a cloud of Chanel No. 5 (which was well reported), she announced that there could be no cease-fire until all American forces had been withdrawn. This was not quite so well reported because no one wanted to hear or believe it. Ho Chi Minh made the second equally clear when in a speech on 3 November he barely mentioned negotiations and called for a 'heightened struggle' to achieve victory. To Hanoi negotiations were part of the war and the table was just as much a battlefield as the ricefields of the Mekong Delta. The United States had yet to learn that negotiations would provide no exit and that she on her side would have to use the negotiating table to foil Hanoi's purpose and to justify the second option of a long haul low cost strategy. If she failed to adopt this approach the United States would find herself compelled in the end, by an erosive process both in Vietnam and at the table, to accept a sell-out, not necessarily as a matter of choice, but as the inevitable agonizing outcome.

'More of the same' or further escalation were no longer options. Neither was acceptable nor were they likely to be effective. The continuation of the previous strategy of attrition with yet more men in the elusive search for a military victory would obviously lead to greater disaster. Whatever losses the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong might have suffered in 1968, by the summer of 1969 they could be expected to have recovered sufficiently to continue countering such a strategy in exactly the same way as they had done through 1966 and 1967, quite possibly at a lower cost in manpower owing to an American reluctance to take correspondingly heavy casualties. A resumption of the bombing of the North, although circumstances such as a failure of negotiations might seem to warrant it, would not now be easy for a new President to justify in support of this worn-out strategy. Further escalation, such as an invasion of the North requiring as it would at least a million men and inviting Chinese intervention, was no longer plausible. There was also nothing to suggest that a massive conventional bombing of the North would be effective in solving the problems of the South. While it might not invite Russian or Chinese intervention, this would only be because such action would in itself be fatal to American grand strategy in that it would tear the country apart and seriously damage the standing and prestige of the United States for decades.

The option of intentionally ending the war by a sell-out was also not one that could be undertaken lightly. Plenty of hopeful reasons have been produced on economic and political grounds to justify the United States getting out of Vietnam at any cost. It is interesting to note that very few have been prepared to spell out the likely consequences of such an eventuality. Even assuming that the negotiations were so well handled both in Paris and in their effect on Saigon that a withdrawal was covered by the facade of a settlement, without leading to a collapse within South Vietnam thereby turning withdrawal into expulsion, it could still not be disguised that the United States would have suffered an ignominious defeat. Plenty of excuses might be advanced and the blame thrown on the South Vietnamese. One of the more fashionable alibis now in favour is

that the Vietnam war was unique and could never have been won by anyone. This simply will not wash. Vietnam may have been different from other insurgencies but then all wars are different, in the sense that the last one is never quite the same as the next, as Generals have learned to their cost. But to claim that it was unique is equivalent to saying that no future war can be won if it is too different from the last one. Certainly Vietnam was very different from Korea but, nevertheless, it was subject to rules and principles which have proved valid elsewhere.

A sell-out would be an inexcusable defeat and the predictable consequences of such a defeat need to be carefully weighed. In South Vietnam itself a people would go under. Judging from past experience in China and North Vietnam perhaps several hundred thousands, who have supported the war and fought valiantly and who would certainly oppose the conqueror's subsequent collectivization programme, might be slaughtered. This will not be shown on television, and so may not worry subverted liberals and fellow travelers,<sup>1</sup> but others may have it on their conscience. There is after all no Formosa to which the victims can escape nor has any area been set aside for them in the Californian desert. In a year or two they will be conveniently forgotten, while the victor is applauded for his acts of expropriation and the consequent stagnation of the economy is advanced as a specious argument for international aid.<sup>2</sup>

There are too many who will see through a camouflaged sellout and who will object, notably in the United States itself. While Senator Joe McCarthy's witch hunts may not be repeated, there cannot fail to be recrimination, not confined only to the powerful military lobby. This on top of America's inevitable loss of confidence in herself could be more damaging to American unity in the next few years than all the dissent of the past few years and seriously weaken the United States' position as leader of the West. After "We will stand in Vietnam" every other American commitment will be exposed to doubt and anxiety on the part of those in whose favour it was made. There will be a tendency on the part of the United States either to retreat towards isolationism or to reconfirm such commitments with added protestations of support (compare the guarantees given to Poland after Munich in 1938). The former would stimulate the "domino theory" while the latter could pave the way for more Vietnams.

The "domino theory" will in any case begin to operate not necessarily, as I have explained, with an immediate outbreak of fresh insurgencies, but rather with drastic realignments of policy certainly in South East Asia, probably in Africa and possibly even in Latin-America. With the failure of western methods of defense in Vietnam, all western methods will be downgraded even in the political, economic and technical fields. The development of freedom and democracy, through plural economic and political societies and the concept of free enterprise, will cease to be attractive because they will appear to render states vulnerable to subversive attack. The great majority of the

countries concerned are all basically agricultural ("the countryside of the world") where millions are acutely anxious less about their form of government than about where the next bowl of rice or maize is coming from. If the industrial countries of the West led by the United States ("the cities of the world") fail or, because of Vietnam, default on their obligation to remedy this situation and to close the widening gap between the rich and poor nations of the world, then these so called "newly emerging forces" will be in a great danger of becoming the future starving masses. It is hard to think of a more explosive situation looming ahead than that a large part of the world, with its backward agriculture and expanding population, may become both communist controlled and starving.

In the atmosphere of turbulence and distrust which would inevitably follow an American defeat in Vietnam, the risk of a third world war would increase. With the United States discredited and the British withdrawing from east of Suez, the Russian penetration of the Indian Ocean would gather momentum and effect. It would also be folly to assume that China would not be looking for further easy pickings and a spread of influence with a united Vietnam as one of her instruments. In the circumstances which would prevail in Asia alone there are at least three countries which, within the next decade, would have to consider going nuclear—India, Japan and eventually Australia. Added to all this there is the danger that, with communist power no longer monolithic but polycentric, with the turmoil of the cultural revolution in China and with the cracks in the eastern bloc revealed by the occupation of Czechoslovakia, a defeat in Vietnam which tended to isolate the United States from her friends and allies could lead to a situation where the chances of miscalculation on all sides would be greatly increased.

It is, therefore, my view that now, more than at any time in the past decade, it is vital for the United States to keep its pledge and stand by South Vietnam. There is no exit and the new President does not really have much choice as far as policy is concerned. He does, however, have the opportunity to change the strategy. The American aim should be revised to read: 'To establish, at a cost acceptable to the United States, South Vietnam as a free, united and independent country which is politically stable and economically expanding'. This does not require a defeat of the North but only that its design to take over the South should be frustrated. To achieve the aim does, however, leave a long haul low cost strategy as the only option.

To be successful, the first requirement is reorganization to provide for joint American/South Vietnamese control machinery at all levels as a means of ensuring a more coordinated and integrated effort in every aspect of the war. On the military side the joint command established in the Saigon area should be considered for the Corps and Divisional Commands (but excluding reserve forces). At the same time there should be a complete reorganization, including some amalgamation, of all South Vietnamese paramilitary forces, followed by retraining courses to improve the performance of those now under arms before there is any question of increasing the numbers. At the highest level of joint control clear priorities should then be laid down with regard to the area to be pacified first and the measures to be taken. The first area selected should be within the heavily populated provinces of the Mekong Delta. Forces should then be allocated to the task and their respective roles clearly defined. It should be the primary objective of the strategy to protect the population within the selected area through the techniques of pacification, including the building of stra-

<sup>1</sup> See *Revolutionary Warfare and Communist Strategy* by Geoffrey Fairbairn (Faber and Faber, 1968) for the manner in which such people are manipulated or coerced.

<sup>2</sup> See William Pfaff, a critic of the war, in Kahn's *Can we win in Vietnam?* p. 167—"What they (the left-wing critics) do not concede is that a Communist victory in Vietnam might create a repressive and antiliberal society, that reprisals and militant ideological indoctrination of an unwilling population might take place, that a Communist government might prove itself quite as capable of despotism and cruelty as any of the non-Communist regimes of the last fifteen years."



tegic hamlets where necessary, to be followed by normal but not lavish aid programmes. Within the area the enemy underground organization should be ruthlessly weeded out, for which purpose the intelligence organization needs to be steadily improved and a greater number of small unit actions initiated with emphasis on ambushes at night. While regular South Vietnamese and American forces must give direct support to the pacification programme, especially through Combined Action Platoons, the majority of the regular units will be required to hold the ring against the main North Vietnamese and Vietcong units, for which purpose a limited number of fix<sup>3</sup> and destroy operations should be mounted together with air attacks outside the populated areas. Outside the selected priority area, within the populated areas of all other provinces, it should be the initial intention merely to maintain the existing situation. This cannot be done by adopting a purely defensive posture. Offensive operations into contested and enemy held areas will still be necessary, for which reason the securely held areas should be limited to allow for an adequate reserve of forces for such operations.

Behind all this there should be a much greater emphasis on nation building, on improving the structure of the government and on training the personnel required to staff it. Here the initial problem will be the direction of South Vietnamese manpower and the deployment of resources so that there is a balanced advance on all fronts. For example, as the pacified area expands, so must government departments with trained personnel available be ready to administer it. This is all a painfully slow process, especially in the early stages, before any momentum is gained. The chief enemy will always be impatience which, as in the past, will tend to encourage an overcommitment of resources over too wide an area, thereby bringing the programme to a standstill.

The effect of this strategic approach should be to reduce the tempo of the war and to achieve an economy of effort. No hard and fast targets should be set but it should be the general intention, within the first year, to reduce the strength of American forces by approximately 100,000 men. A start on this should be possible as a result of the bombing halt, and further economies might be made by a close analysis of the value of certain units, including support units, and by a measure of 'house cleaning'. It should also be possible to reduce costs by cutting down all those activities which produce a negligible return for the effort expended. This covers much of the air reconnaissance and of the harassing fire. Within a reasonable period of one to two years it should be possible to halve the cost of the war and gradually to reduce it further to a level roughly equivalent to the annual increase in Federal revenue. With a reduction in search and destroy operations and with the enemy being forced to come out and fight on ground not of his own choosing, the casualty rate should be significantly reduced though there is bound to be an occasional bad week. In this way the whole cost of the war, in every sense, could be reduced to a level which would be acceptable to the majority in the United States, without proving to be an excessive drain on her manpower, money or emotions.

At the same time the continuation of the war must be justified. Quite apart from both the enormously satisfying result, if the aim is achieved and the pledge honoured, and the benefits which would follow for the South Vietnamese, it is for this reason that negotiations must be kept going however far apart

<sup>3</sup> "Fix" rather than "search", i.e., destroy when you get a fix and do not waste too much effort searching.

both sides may find themselves at the table. It would be a good starting point for the United States to suggest a return to the Geneva Agreements, to include a referendum within the South, which would answer Hanoi's main public justification for the war. This would compel Hanoi to explain what exactly she expected to get over and above the Agreements and to justify her case for such gains other than as the spoils of aggression. There are two main points on which no concession should be made—any further partition of South Vietnam or any form of coalition government, with the Vietcong holding certain Ministries in the government by right of conquest. The latter did not work in Czechoslovakia in 1948, nor in Laos in 1962, nor will it work in South Vietnam in 1969. The most that should be accorded, in the new U.S. President's words, is 'participation in the political processes . . . by those who may now be in the NLF, provided that they renounce the use of force and accept the verdict of elections'—that is of the majority. If the United States goes beyond this and holds out the prospect of an eventual victory at the table, both the fighting and the negotiating will go on, until that victory is attained. The answer to fighting while negotiating is to fight while negotiating—but to fight for a positive, honourable and acceptable solution.

Hanoi's reaction to a long haul low cost strategy can be expected in three stages. The first, in 1969 or early in 1970, might be to mount another all out offensive in an attempt to demonstrate that no progress was being made and to keep American costs high especially in casualties. At this she might have some success but at a great cost to herself. Strictly in terms of statistics it might be made to look like the Tet offensive all over again, but here it is necessary to discriminate between an operation carried out when on the strategic offensive and an operation carried out when on the strategic defensive. The first is a bid for victory while the second is a counter-attack to stave off defeat (compare the German Ardennes offensives of 1940 and 1944). That it was the second would have to be made abundantly clear.

Following on a failure of the first, and after a rearguard-like action of perhaps a year or two of intermittent guerrilla activity, during which the constructive programmes would gain momentum and a continuing reduction in cost and in American troop levels would become possible, the second reaction might be to accept a settlement at the negotiating table in the hope of being able to revert to a 'legal struggle'. Ideally the correct answer to this would be refusal, as Tunku Abdul Rahman refused Chin Peng's offer at Baling in 1955. However, this could not be done since the United States has already committed herself to the acceptance of an honourable settlement and could not go back on it. This would be the moment when the negotiations might be broadened, as a means of guaranteeing the settlement (though China would not oblige), and the United Nations might be brought in, rather than the International Control Commission, to establish the supervisory machinery. Upon the effectiveness of the guarantees would depend the third reaction with Hanoi falling back on the *status quo* in the hope that, when the dust of this war had settled, another opportunity would arise in the future. That in turn would depend on the success of the nation building programme and on the recovery made by South Vietnam in the post-war years, which could, with American help, be quite remarkable.

In 1969, therefore, the United States will have to make her choice either to end the war or to continue fighting while negotiating by adopting a long haul low cost strategy. The first requires only an acceptance of defeat whatever the consequences may be. The second will require courage, determination,

persistence and, above all, patience. It could take three to five years before Hanoi was compelled to give up her purpose and to negotiate a real settlement (or just fade away). Even then the United States could not relax. A continuing but much reduced military commitment would still be required, as in Korea, and there would be a great reconstruction task ahead for many years. This would not be a simple or easy solution but a complete if not altogether a happy victory could still be won.

## NATIONAL MAGAZINE PRAISES COLUMBUS' ARCHITECTURAL PROGRAM

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert this excellent article from the October 19 issue of This Week magazine, which outlines a unique community improvement program in Columbus, Ind.

Columbus' outstanding public buildings and religious structures have been drawing worldwide attention in recent years. The This Week article, by Mr. Victor Block, describes the efforts of the Cummins Engine Foundation in Columbus in getting the Nation's top architects to design these structures.

As a resident of Columbus, I can attest to the success of the program in providing the impetus for community improvement programs.

As pointed out by Mr. Block, the program also is helping to attract and keep intelligent, vigorous young people, who will continue to work to make Columbus an attractive place in which to work and to live.

The article reads as follows:

HOW COLUMBUS DISCOVERED ARCHITECTURE AND BECAME BEAUTIFUL  
(By Victor Block)

Until the mid-1950's Columbus, Ind.—a town of less than 30,000 people located about 40 miles south of Indianapolis—was a typical, disorganized sprawl of houses and hodgepodge of neon-lighted stores, like so many small towns. Then a resident with an idea began to change that pattern.

J. Erwin Miller is chairman of the board of the Cummins Engine Co., Inc., the world's largest producer of diesel engines. Miller's uncle had started the firm in his garage. As it grew, Cummins Engine found it increasingly difficult to attract high-salaried engineers and executive to the small Midwestern town.

This problem, combined with the artistic interests of Miller, a graduate of Yale and Oxford, an amateur musician and a Greek scholar, started an architectural revolution that revitalized the town and that has drawn the attention of architects throughout the world.

A basis for the ambitious architecture program already existed in a simple and tasteful First Christian Church, designed in 1940 by famed Finnish architect Eliel Saarinen. It was one of the first contemporary churches in this country.

After World War II, Miller, commissioned Eero Saarinen, Eliel's son, to draw the plans for the Irwin Union Bank, a block from the famous church. The success of the low, glass-walled bank building led Miller to implement his architectural plan.

The Cummins Engine Foundation, established by Miller in 1954, offered to pay the architect's fee for any new school building if the school board would choose from a list of six or more first-rank architects, suggested for each school by a disinterested panel. The architect would have totaled responsibility for planning and design of the school.

Not surprisingly, the school board accepted this offer. Leading architects—Harry Weese of Chicago; Norman Fletcher of The Architects Collaborative of Cambridge, Mass.; John Carl Warnecke of San Francisco; Edward Barnes of New York—took assignments in Columbus, and outstanding school buildings were built in all sections of town.

Residents, somewhat skeptical at first, were won over by the imaginative and artful ways these architects applied their skills to very practical problems. For example, Warnecke's McDowell Elementary School, built in an old, somewhat drab section of town, consists of four clusters, each with three glass-walled classrooms, connected by covered walks. The small, park-like area enclosed by the buildings provides garden plots for children to plant and tend.

The Richards Elementary School, designed by Edward Barnes, has saw-toothed skylights which provide natural light for classrooms and leave walls free for displays and work tables. The angular silhouette also provides contrast with the monotonous repetition of the subdivision homes in the neighborhood.

Lincoln School, designed by Gunnar Birkerts of Birmingham, Mich., is surrounded by small frame houses. Birkerts designed a two-story building with the bottom floor below street level and had trees planted around the square-block site. As the trees grow, they will completely shield the school from its urban surroundings. Earth embankments and spacing of play areas at varying levels contribute to the maximum use of limited space. Inside, classrooms and corridors surround a central core, a two-story-high gymnasium-cafeteria-assembly area, lighted through roof-top skylights and fluorescent lighting.

When taxpayers complained about the cost of these "fancy" schools, supporters of the program had a ready reply. Dr. Clarence Robbins, the school superintendent, pointed out that one elementary school completed in 1963 cost \$15.48 per square foot, compared with the statewide average that year of \$15.44. Today, the square-foot cost remains only slightly above the state average.

Dr. Robbins also claims that benefits derived from the architectural quality far outweigh the slight cost difference. Good schools attract better teachers and administrators. More than 40 per cent of the teachers in Columbus have advanced degrees or are working on them. In addition, the reputation of the town's outstanding school system attracts new, well-educated citizens who are interested and active in efforts to further improve the quality of education for their children.

The success of this school building program soon paid off in still other ways. Harry Weese was commissioned to design new factory and research buildings for Cummins, branches for the Irwin Union Bank, and a clubhouse for the 18-hole municipal golf course, itself laid out by the leading course planner Robert Trent Jones and donated to the city by the Cummins Engine Co. Even the architect's fee for a new sub-regional U.S. Post Office that is now under construction was paid by Cummins.

Today, a tour booklet distributed by the Columbus Area Chamber of Commerce to tourists, architecture students, and other visitors lists 31 examples of outstanding buildings. Aside from schools, churches, and banks, these include a library, children's home, home for the aged, hospital annex, two fire stations, and a clubhouse built alongside the town's ice skating rink, which was do-

nated by another local foundation following Cummins' lead.

The fact that not all of the buildings result directly from participation by the Cummins Engine Foundation, which has spent about \$1.5 million to date, indicates the positive results of such a program. For example, the Bartholomew County Library Board hired architect I. M. Pei, designer of the Kennedy Memorial Library and other monumental projects, for the new Cleo Rogers Memorial library.

Architectural fees for two churches—the North Christian Church designed by Eero Saarinen and the First Baptist Church by Harry Weese—were paid by their congregations. Saarinen's design alone would be enough to draw international attention to Columbus. The church is hexagon shaped, the hexagon representing Judaism's Star of David from which Christianity emerged. It is topped by a slender 192-foot spire. The interior, almost windowless and soft-lighted from a skylight and by reflection through openings under the eaves, has strong, simple lines that give a feeling of both peace and spiritual uplift.

The interest in quality architecture that has led to construction of such outstanding buildings has not stopped there. Cummins got a leading urban planner and designer, Alexander Girard of New Mexico, to suggest a method of breathing life into Columbus' aging downtown. Girard's plan: Join the shops with a continuous valance across their fronts, and replace the wild jumble of competing signs with coordinated lettering. Then, to accent the elaborate cornices and fancy moldings on the rows of late-19th century buildings that line Washington Street, paint them a variety of bright contrasting colors.

Cummins paid to have a test block renovated and the idea began to catch on. Freshly painted buildings on nearby blocks now dot the downtown shopping area.

The feeling of pride in their town by the residents of Columbus has brought other benefits. Warnecke's glass-walled McDowell school, built in a low-income neighborhood, has had very few windows broken in the years since it was completed. Furthermore, residents near new buildings, even in homes priced under \$10,000, have begun to paint and face-lift their modest dwellings.

Old apartment buildings and other downtown structures have been freshly painted. Instead of being torn down, as some people suggested, the quaint Victorian courthouse near the center of town has been renovated, in part to serve as contrast to the modern, new buildings rising around it. And the Columbus Jaycees are turning a swampy area that was once the site of tar-paper shacks into Mill Race Park, a recreation area with boating and fishing facilities, picnic tables, play equipment, and an old covered bridge that was carted to the site.

Today, Cummins has little trouble attracting the well-educated young management and research people it needs, and, because Miller turned his dream into reality, Columbus is one of the fastest growing, most active communities in Indiana.

#### AMERICAN TEAMWORK

### HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, teamwork is the hallmark of Americans. No people are more noted for their ability to pitch in together and get the job done—especially when the need is great and the job ahead is hard.

Now President Nixon has called for teamwork in a time of great need. The job ahead is hard indeed. For the present, let us sink our partisan differences, put politics aside for the period we need to accomplish the vital reforms the President has put before us. The objectives—as Mr. Nixon has pointed out—are those which the American people have commissioned Congress and the President to achieve. Bickering over who is to blame for not yet accomplishing these objectives will not help anything. We have a job to do. The President and the people have asked us to get the job done. Let us pitch in and do it—and sort the political credits out later.

#### A UKRAINIAN RESOLUTION ON RELIGION AND HUMAN RIGHTS

### HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, on June 9, 1969, the Ukrainian organizations of New Jersey, affiliated with the Ukrainian Congress Committee, held a meeting at Newark, N.J., at which time they adopted a resolution condemning the harsh treatment of the Ukrainian people by their alien rulers.

As Members of Congress, we have risen many times to deplore the acts of the alien governments in trying to impose their rule upon the nations behind the Iron Curtain. Each one of these nations is desperately trying to obtain freedom for themselves and the right to live as an independent nation.

Through this resolution, the New Jersey group of Ukrainians condemns this harsh treatment endured by the Ukrainians and asks for a peaceful and just solution to put an end to it.

The resolution follows:

#### RESOLUTION OF UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA

We, the undersigned, the representatives of the Ukrainian Organizations under the direction of the Executives of the Newark Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, the national representative body of over 2 million Americans of Ukrainian descent, gathered at a special meeting, held on Monday, June 9, 1969, in Newark, N.J., unanimously adopted the following resolution:

Whereas, the Soviet Government destroyed the Ukrainian Autocephalic Orthodox Church in the 1930's by murdering over 30 archbishops and bishops, and over 20,000 clergy; and

Whereas, the Kremlin has ruthlessly annihilated the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Western Ukraine by arresting 11 bishops and over 2,000 Catholic priests, monks and nuns, and forced some 5 million Ukrainian Catholics into the fold of the Communist-Controlled Russian Orthodox Church against their will and conviction; and

Whereas, on January 27, 1969, the KGB has arrested in Lviv, Ukraine, Archbishop Vasyl Welychkovsky, a high-ranking prelate of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, as well as a number of other Catholic priests; and

Whereas, the Soviet government persistently harasses and persecutes Christian adherents in Ukraine by closing the houses of worship of the Baptists, Evangelicals, Jehovah's Witnesses and others; and



Whereas, the government of the Soviet Union has been engaged in a relentless policy of russification in Ukraine by imposing the Russian language and culture, and by arresting, trying and deporting Ukrainian intellectuals for their loyalty to and defense of the Ukrainian culture and national heritage; and

Whereas, the Soviet government is guilty of flagrant and systematic violations of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, to which it has been an official signatory, particularly Art. 18 of the said Declaration, which provides for the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion, as well as Art. 2 and 15 which provide for the equality of all races and nationalities.

Now, therefore, we hereby unanimously resolve:

1. To dispatch this resolution to the two Senators and the U.S. Representatives from the State of New Jersey, and to members of the State Legislature of the State of New Jersey, so as to inform them about the religious, political and cultural persecution of some 46,000,000 Ukrainian people by the alien regime of Communist Russia;

2. To ask these elected representatives of the State of New Jersey to prevail upon the U.S. Government to raise at all high-level conferences with the rulers of the USSR the question of the actual negation of the right of self-determination of the Ukrainian Nation as well as all other captive nations now enslaved by the USSR and its subservient communist satellites in Europe and Asia.

Alliance of the Friends of Ukrainian Democratic Republic Branch in Newark, N.J.

American-Ukrainian Citizen Club, Inc. Newark, N.J.

Association for Free Ukraine, Inc. (O.P.W.B.U.).

Brotherhood of Former Soldiers of the First Ukrainian Div. U.N.A.

Fathers' Committee of St. John Ukrainian Catholic School in Newark, N.J.

Federation of Ukrainian Student Organizations of America Branch of Newark, N.J. Ladies Sodality.

Organization for the Defense of Lemkivshchyna Branch No. 5 in Newark, N.J.

Organization for the Rebirth of Ukraine (ODWU) Inc. Branch No. 70 in Newark, N.J.

Organization of Defense of Four Freedoms of Ukraine, Inc. Branch No. 1 in Newark, N.J.

"Plast" Inc. Ukrainian Youth Organization, Chapter No. 17.

Ridna Shkola.

Selfreliance Association.

Society of Veterans of Ukrainian Insurgent Army, Inc.

The Providence Association of the Ukrainian Catholics in America.

The Ukrainian Music Institute of America, Inc. Branch Newark, N.J.

Ukrainian-American Businessmen's Association of Newark, N.J.

Ukrainian American Youth Association, Inc.

Ukrainian Athletic Association "Chornomorska Sitch", Inc.

Ukrainian Choir Society "Trembita."

Ukrainian Community Center, Inc.

Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc. Branch for Newark, N.J. and Vicinity.

Ukrainian Evangelical Baptist Church in Newark, N.J.

Ukrainian Hetman Organization of America, Inc., Branch No. 14, Newark, N.J.

Ukrainian National Aid Association of America, Branch No. 161, Newark, N.J.

Ukrainian National Association Inc., District Committee, Newark, N.J.

Ukrainian National Women's League of America, Inc. Branches No. 28 and No. 86 in Newark, N.J.

Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Holy Ascension in Newark, N.J.

Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Holy Trinity in Irvington, N.J.

Ukrainian Research and Information Institute, Inc., Branch No. 7 in Newark, N.J. Ukrainian Workingmen's Association of State of New Jersey.

United Ukrainian War Veterans in America.

## MINERAL ENTRY IN THE PUBLIC LANDS

### HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the hardest working organizations devoted to the preservation of our minerals industries is the Western Mining Council directed by its president, Mr. Lee I. Rowland, of Mariposa, Calif.

Mr. Rowland is a miner of many, many years experience and is recognized as an outstanding spokesman for the industry and especially for the small miners which contributed so much to the growth and greatness of the Mother Lode area of California which I am proud to represent here in Congress.

Recently the Western Mining Council published its recommendations to the President of the United States and to this Congress relating to the procedures pertaining to mineral entry within the public land. These recommendations have been submitted by me to the Public Land Law Review Commission and to the President and I would like to share with my colleagues the recommendations made by the Western Mining Council and insert these in the RECORD at this point:

WESTERN MINING COUNCIL RECOMMENDS TO THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES THE FOLLOWING PROCEDURES PERTAINING TO MINERAL ENTRY

Western Mining Council believes that whenever feasible, all minerals located on lands about to be inundated by lakes or reservoirs should be removed before the construction of the dams or other structures that are to be built in these areas.

Western Mining Council opposes the addition to the Federal Mineral Leasing Act, any minerals other than those already being administered under this Act. We believe that all minerals not now under the Federal Mineral Leasing Act should remain under the regulation of the Mining Laws of 1872, and should be open for entry to anyone that locates and develops these ore bodies.

Western Mining Council further believes that the intent of the Mining Laws of 1872 are clearly defined and spelled out. However, the executive agency seems to have chosen to misinterpret the intent and purpose of these laws, resulting in harassment and intimidation of mining claim holders, and in our opinion, illegal invalidation of mining claims. We therefore ask you to revert to the principles of the Mining Laws of 1872.

Western Mining Council feels that any tampering with the Mining Laws that would in any way change the intent of the Mining Laws of 1872, or tend to disenfranchise the rights of prospectors and mining claim holders would be in violation of the intent and purpose of the Preamble of the Constitution of the United States of America, and would impair the economy of this Nation today and for generations to come.

Western Mining Council recommends that in the future all Bills or Laws pertaining to the administration of the public lands of the United States shall be written in such

a manner so as to fully state the intent and purpose of these laws and the method of administration shall be stated in such a manner as to leave no doubt as to the administration procedure of said Bill or Act.

Western Mining Council asks Congress to classify the public lands of the United States in such a manner that will promote the production of domestic minerals and enhance mining in the United States. We feel that we would be making a mistake to allow our economy to become dependent upon minerals imported from other countries for use in our industries.

## FROM MISSOULA WITH LOVE FOR THE EVERGLADES

### HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, high level talks have continued for the past several weeks relative to the proposed construction of a jetport to service Everglades National Park, Fla. Proponents and opponents have vigorously debated all ramifications of the project, and national attention has been directed to the predicted destruction of the park's facilities.

All ages, all walks of life, all conservation-minded Americans are awaiting the final decision, and one particularly knowledgeable group from Montana's Garden City—Missoula, has taken the time to let me know exactly what they think. And I think what they have to say is worth repeating for my colleagues to hear.

For the RECORD, and to be underscored as opponents to the construction of the Everglades Jetport, I would offer the following statements from members of the fifth grade class at Cold Springs School, Missoula, Mont.:

It (the jetport) will kill good fishing and a lot of wild life. In a way I think animals are better than people so please don't harm them.

I think it is mean to kill all those animals and destroy the forest. Animals are just as important as people and we need the wilderness to make the world beautiful.

Animals like to live in peace, why disturb their life? Why let them live a life of confusion? It's bad enough for us to live in a world of confusion.

The jetport to be constructed in Florida will destroy 20 different kinds of animal life. For your information, you and I are animals ourselves. Just because we have guns, machines, money, metals, and plastics, etc., weavers don't need concrete or heavy machinery. They use what they can find like sticks for metal and mud for concrete. You fancy people don't know the affairs of the common people or animals. People slaughtered buffalo and eagles, and here come the Everglades' animals.

I don't like the idea of ruining the Everglades by that stupid jetport. They can build it someplace else. The alligators need some place to live. It would be like someone taking your home from you.

I heard about the jetport and killing the animals in Florida. I do not think that it should happen. Because we get food from them. And also they are just as good as us.

I hope you heard about the new industry in the Everglades National Park. About the biggest airport in the whole world. Why can't they build it in Kansas or Georgia?

The names of these fifth graders are: Scott Diettert, Ted Craft, Stacey Jordan, David Bristow, Scott Sax, Debbie Larson, Jim Bradford, Tommy Gress, Ken Brown, Felicia Fahey, Gina McDowell, Steve Daniels, Terri Anderson, Colleen Flynn, Debbie Roberts, Kari Morgan, Terri Rasmussen, Douglas Turman, Renee Oertli. Their teacher is Raymond D. DeNeve.

#### LEGISLATION TO TERMINATE THE SUGAR QUOTA FOR SOUTH AFRICA

### HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleague from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) in introducing legislation to terminate the sugar quota for South Africa and to redistribute this quota among certain developing Africa nations.

In April of this year, along with other Members of this House and Senator KENNEDY in the other body, we introduced a bill to terminate the South African sugar quota which amounts to an annual subsidy to South Africa of about \$4 million. The racial policies of South Africa are repugnant to many citizens of this country, and have been condemned by most of the countries of the world. The sugar subsidy benefits not the black South African who works on the sugar plantation but the white minority—which already enjoys one of the highest standards of living anywhere in the world. Our support, through the sugar subsidy, of the policy of apartheid is an affront both to our own black citizens and to the nations of black Africa.

Equally, the developing nations of black Africa need the assistance now going to the racist government of South Africa for their own economic development. In particular, Mauritius, Malagasy, Swaziland, and Uganda produce sugar well in excess of their own consumption requirements and, in the case of the first three, well in excess of their present small U.S. sugar quotas. Uganda has no U.S. quota at all.

The President has the authority to suspend South Africa's sugar quota by Executive order but specific legislation is required to redistribute it to particular non-Western Hemisphere countries. Thus, our bill would redistribute the South African sugar quota to Mauritius, Malagasy, Swaziland, and Uganda.

Mr. Speaker, in my view, it is essential that this legislation be considered at the earliest possible opportunity by this Congress. Enactment of this measure will be a signal to black Africa that the United States is willing to back its moral opposition to apartheid with concrete actions.

#### GRASSROOTS SENTIMENT OF MORATORIUM DAY

### HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I would be the last person in the world to make suggestions to our friends in the newspaper business with regard to personnel assignments for their reporters and columnists but I have often thought that reporters assigned to New York and Washington ought to be required to spend several weeks or longer serving a stint in other parts of the country. Perhaps an exchange program could be arranged with newspapers in smaller towns and cities around the country who would take these big city reporters and put them in close touch with the real grassroots sentiment on some of the major issues of the day, hopefully to give them a broader picture than what they seem to get in talking to each other and reading each other's material.

In any event, I include the following editorials from the Peoria Journal Star edition of October 17 and the Chicago Tribune edition of today relating to the Vietnam Moratorium Day exercise last Wednesday in the RECORD at this point so that our friends in the press gallery can get an idea of the sentiment being expressed in other sections of the country:

#### THE "LIBERAL" LINE

Some very strange conclusions have attended last week's Viet Nam "moratorium," which its organizers hope to make a monthly thing. The Crimson, student newspaper at Harvard, not only printed a Viet Cong flag on its front page but also ran an editorial supporting the National Liberation Front, political facade for the communist guerrilla operation.

It said that the front, "whom we have been trying to exterminate, has the support of the people of Viet Nam" and therefore "it deserves our support." This hardly accords with the fact, to which we gave editorial attention yesterday, that the government of South Viet Nam controls areas of South Viet Nam in which 89 per cent of the people live, and that these people have organized self-defense forces against the Communists numbering a million and a half persons.

In other quarters the "moratorium" was seized on by "liberal" columnists as an excuse for threatening the Nixon administration. Joseph Kraft, who fancies himself as a latter-day Walter Lippmann, remarked with evident relish that the President was being "pushed into a corner where his only choice will be a bugout." This callous indifference to defeat and disgrace, and to the repudiation of the nation's commitment to defend a friendly people from conquest and mass murder at the hands of the Communists, is unseemly in anyone pretending to be a responsible commentator.

Mr. Kraft's itch to whoop up an enemy victory is also reflected in the comment of Nicholas von Hoffman, columnist for the Washington Post, that the "moratorium" constituted an "ultimatum" to Mr. Nixon and other politicians. "Either the war must end or the resistance must grow and take tougher forms," he says. This is an incitement to violence by anti-war groups.

Mr. von Hoffman also celebrates as heroes those who broke into draft induction centers and threw blood on files "or got their

heads beaten standing in front of induction centers or, like Capt. Howard Levy, took a court martial and a jail sentence." The destruction of draft files is unlawful, and the refusal of an officer in uniform to obey lawful orders is a betrayal of the oath he takes when he is commissioned, but Mr. von Hoffman sees nothing to object to in such behavior.

Then there is Harrison Salisbury, assistant managing editor of the New York Times, who said at a book forum here just after all the furor of the "moratorium" that he seriously saw the possibility of a war between Russia and Red China and threw in the observation that this would be a war from which this country could not stand aside.

We don't know where Mr. Salisbury stands on bugging out of Viet Nam, but from some knowledge of his intellectual history we assume that he would be in favor of it. It is certainly strange that at a time when so much emotion has been generated to that end anybody should be proposing that we get out of one war only to jump into another bigger and nastier one—a war, moreover, over which most Americans would be disposed to cry: "Go it, bear! Go it, dragon!"

If, as Mr. Salisbury conceives, it is America's duty to go to the aid of one or the other communist adversary, which does he nominate as our prospective ally? Whichever we might adopt would, at least, have the ironic effect of creating even more poisonous divisions among the fractured factions of the peacenik left, some of which are Maoists, some Kremlin lovers, some Castroites, and some something else.

And just why, we inquire, if Viet Nam is not the right war at the right place and at the right time, would our barging into a Sino-soviet brawl be all of these things?

#### A GREAT SHOW

(By C. L. Dancey)

It was a great show.

Every trick in the trade was used, except naked actors.

They trotted out Ted Kennedy in Boston, Mrs. Martin Luther King in Washington, Harry Belafonte in California. They offered the kids an excused holiday from the boredom and labor of classwork. On selected campuses, they moved in famous TV newsmen with their camera crews . . . which added to the excitement, of course.

Then, these few unique campuses bustling with national network attention, were presented to the nation as the representative examples of what was happening! Three months of organized effort was billed as "spontaneous", "mushrooming" reaction!

And there was an extra added bonus, not so available during the long years of this war when there were no withdrawals only increases, and when casualties were running 400 per cent higher than today.

That was the political addition of prominent Democrats eager to begin the process of ripping apart a Republican president—and who cares how?

I think it was Walter Cronkite who described this without mentioning its obvious partisan motive and flavor as a phenomenon whereby the protests were becoming "respectable!"

So, it was a great show, and a galloping propaganda coup.

As an expression of the American people, however, and a meaningful political exercise, we do not share the confidence of some that propaganda is all powerful and promotion assures the swaying of the 200,000,000 Americans who didn't take part.

To people enamored of their role in blatting out promotion and seeking their own political consequences, this may be the magic "key" to "control" of America's electorate.



We are not so enamored. We are not so contemptuous of the public. We are not blind to the 150,000,000 Americans living in modest towns and villages and cities across the land who were skipped over as unimportant in this coverage of major city shows and college towns.

We are not blind to the fact that across Illinois, colleges with thousands of students had thousands of students attending class as usual while only a few hundred on each campus took holiday and a meaningful part in the "protest." We are not blind to the fact that in hundreds of cities and towns with no college, not a single two-finger salute was even raised.

I am sure that most students, and most people are concerned—indeed, deeply concerned. But I doubt that they are so eager to shoot down a President who has been the first to conceive of a process for extricating ourselves that is actually functional.

I doubt if they are eager to add to Hanoi's confidence and arrogance.

I doubt if they are eager to play Hanoi's game, as Hanoi is now publicly bidding them to do.

I doubt if they look any way but with a jaundiced eye on those opportunistic Democrats who have changed their tunes so drastically now that there is a Republican in office trying to clean up the mess.

One suspects that this great mass of Americans is getting jaded with this hokey, show business approach to the serious business at hand.

One suspects that they are getting fed up to the eyeballs with abusive, exaggerated, demagogic blasts and the theory that democracy "like a harlot" functions in the streets.

And, as usual, the desperate politicians, the entertainer-professors, and the eager "part of the action" campus movers lag behind the public moved changes—and will be the last to know . . . except possibly for Walter Cronkite.

This is a funny country. Again and again we have seen a tide swell on the surface and the "trend" seem to be rampaging uncontrolled—until suddenly comes the straw that breaks the camel's back.

Suddenly, discover with shock and surprise that "enough is enough", and we are smashed by a truly spontaneous and universal public reaction from the people who are accused of apathy because they do not respond to the "pep rally" approach and do not staminate at the first drumbeat of the propagandists.

In them decision-making builds slowly. It simmers. And when it surfaces, their numbers and their power is surprising, shocking, and shattering.

The propaganda blasts are stirring them, now—but how? For? or Against?

We believe the restraint of the mass of Americans at moratorium time, in the face of massive drumbeating, the various extra-added attractions, had a subtle new flavor. We believe, this time, it was a uniquely AWARE and CONSCIOUS restraint.

There were stirring in it and faint rumbles.

Something is building in the folks who don't staminate before gimmickery and show business tricks. Sooner or later it will likely surface with its awesome power.

#### MAJORITY VIEWPOINT

#### HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Warner & Swasey Co. is noted for its cogent

advertisements. One such appearing in the current issue of U.S. News & World Report follows. I share this company's hope that Americans will say so in the most effective way they can—which is at the ballot box next fall.

The article follows:

#### WE'RE NOT RUNNING FOR OFFICE SO WE CAN SPEAK OUR MINDS

1. No taxpayer we know would allow anyone to go hungry, but he's getting tired of soaring relief rolls in this decade of all-time high prosperity, and he feels he's being overtaxed to support people not willing to look very hard for jobs to support themselves.

2. We believe leaders who know far more about it than we do got us involved in Vietnam, and other leaders will get us out as soon as it is safe for America, but in the meantime we believe we should support our fighting men and not support our enemies by attacking our government.

3. We think every worker should be paid well for what he produces, but we object to the kind of inflation brought on by unions who demand more and more money for no more productivity.

4. Every American should get as much education as he can afford and absorb, but we think unkempt youngsters trying to tell a college what to do should be disciplined and sent home until they learn manners.

5. We believe this is the greatest nation in the world but that's in spite of—not because of—too many politicians who keep themselves in power by squandering the taxpayers' hard-earned money.

And we think the great majority of the 200 million Americans feel the same way we do. We hope they'll say so.

#### YOUNG GIVE THE OLD A HAND

#### HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have always held a high regard for the young people in this Nation. For the most part, they are active, intelligent, and sincerely interested in a better society. Most teenagers in America are patriotic, brave, and understanding people. I wish to take this opportunity to pay them another compliment.

The occasion of these remarks is the publication of an Associated Press story in the Minneapolis Tribune newspaper. In the account of an incident in Westbury, N.Y., teenagers are pictured as the good citizens I know them to be. The community of Westbury, according to the story, reduced the funds available to the local senior citizen program because of an economy drive. Without funds, the senior citizen activities would have had to be discontinued. The high school, junior high school, and other students took up the program as their project.

I insert the article in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Oct. 14, 1969]

#### STUDENTS HELP SAVE PROGRAM FOR ELDERLY

WESTBURY, N.Y.—Hundreds of teen-agers are working enthusiastically to save a program that enriches the lives of the older people residing in Westbury, a Long Island community.

The Westbury Senior Citizens' program

faces extinction because funds for the 13-year-old project were eliminated from the Westbury budget as an economy move. The program provides educational, creative art and social activities for older residents. About 170 persons participate regularly.

When Westbury's young people learned that \$5,500 was needed to keep the oldsters' project going until July 1970, they began working to make up the deficit.

The Westbury High School senior class of 1970 decided that aid to the senior citizens would be their class project. The student council and the junior high school pupils joined in the task.

Thomas A. Harris, an insurance man who is helping Westbury's senior citizens, said the efforts of the youngsters have netted about \$1,500. Some of this sum came when 500 attended a spaghetti dinner in the high school cafeteria.

The teen-agers and their elders in this middle-class suburb of New York City are preparing for another fund-raising affair, a band concert at the high school.

James W. Hardy, president of the Westbury Senior Citizens Program, was asked how he felt about the help from the teen-agers. Hardy, 86 years old and retired, said:

"The young people were given an opportunity to do something constructive. They rose to the occasion. It's when youngsters have nothing to do that they often get into trouble.

"Give them opportunities for good works. Give them responsibilities. They won't let you down."

#### RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

#### HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Claude M. Ury, a member of the faculty of San Francisco State College, and a member of the Presidential Task Force on Education, has written a most informative article on new developments in vocational education which has appeared in the September issue of Catholic School Journal.

Because of the great interest of the Federal Government in these programs, and the great expenditure of public funds to support them, I would hope that the Members would review Dr. Ury's comments.

The article follows:

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION—THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1968 AUTHORIZE NEW FUNDS FOR VOCATIONAL TRAINING IN SCHOOL OR ON THE JOB

(By Claude M. Ury)

We live in a time when there is an alarming estrangement of youth from many of our cultural and religious values. Young people are not so unperceptive that they cannot sense what is irrelevant in education or what "short-changes" them. The result can be a total estrangement from all values represented by the educational institution. That would be tragic.

If, for any reason, good vocational counseling is impossible or incompatible with the present school structure, perhaps the school's administration should consider the following policies:

Refuse to take all "comers" and admit only those who can succeed in and afford a college education.

Re-evaluate expensive sports programs and see if precious dollars can be channeled into guidance or industrial arts programs.

Take a hint from the thinking behind the new federal legislation for vocational education: almost every person can be trained for some gainful occupation. If he is not so trained, then society is failing him. Can we honestly wash our hands of the under-achiever simply by flunking him?

If anyone doubts the grave shortages of properly trained skilled workers he has only to recall the last time he tried to get his automobile repaired, or his television set, or his washing machine. He has only to look at the want ad section of the newspaper filled with the same help-wanted classifieds every day. The auto industry alone can use 5,000 new auto mechanics every year. Industry is clamoring for technicians to work with engineers. Recent government estimates claim that a million more jobs for technicians will be available by 1975.

Federal funds for vocational education alone come to nearly a billion dollars annually and, with local expenditures, the total comes to several billion dollars. As rapidly as possible, states are moving to provide all types of vocational training. Area vocational schools are being built at the rate of about fifty a year. By 1970 there will be over a thousand technical schools providing sub-baccalaureate training programs.

It would be a shame if the products of our Catholic high schools were not prepared to take full advantage of the training opportunities these schools will offer.

Preparation of young people for the world of work is an essential function of society. Currently, there are many interacting forces that influence newly emerging patterns of the occupational world. These forces are especially evident in the large cities of the United States. The development of the large urban complex, continued population growth and changing population characteristics, the imbalance between manpower supply and labor market demands, accelerated technological development and the challenge of automation are illustrative of conditions that have major implications for programs of preparation for the world of work.

Jacob J. Kaufman of Pennsylvania State University, in his recently completed study "The Role of the Secondary Schools in the Preparation of Youth for Employment," has concluded: "Vocational guidance should be expanded in a number of directions. It should begin in the elementary school to prepare youngsters for their experiences in the redirected form of vocational education. In the junior and senior high school, courses in the nature of occupations should supplement vocational courses. To free more of the counselor's time for student contact greater reliance should be placed on group counseling, technological innovations, and clerical assistance."

The U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has stated: "The unemployment of youth between the ages of 16 and 21 . . . is approximately three times the level of the total labor force. It has been estimated that 1,100,000 young people between 16 and 21 are neither in school nor at work." A large portion of this group is concentrated in the urban centers of our country. Unemployment is costly not only to those directly involved but to the whole society. Not only do the unemployed contribute nothing to the economy, but their impact on the community is felt in increased relief and welfare payments, delinquency and crime.

Several illustrative research projects, which have been funded by the U.S. Office of Education, seek to develop new and more effective guidance materials and procedures. One project, for example, at Stanford University has been experimenting with ways of simulating actual job experiences, thus providing the young person with a more realistic

appreciation of what it means to be an accountant, an X-ray technician or a police officer. Experimental kits have been developed that stimulate students to explore groups of occupations.

In another project, concerning vocational development and vocational education in adolescence, Professor John Crites of the University of Iowa constructed and standardized a test for measuring vocational maturity in adolescence. The test includes an attitude scale designed to measure certain attitudes that are assumed to play an important part in the process of choosing a vocation.

The Office of Education, the American Institute for Research and the public school system of Quincy, Mass., are collaborating to build a complete curriculum for Quincy. The Quincy program involves the tenth grade and above, including a two-year, post secondary curriculum. The program is built around "families of occupations encompassing 255 specific occupational skills." The content for the curriculum is explicitly derived from an analysis of desired student behavior after graduation. The two-year, post secondary school is open to those who graduate from high school. This secondary school program is paralleled by the rapid development of junior and community college programs as evidenced in the states of California, Pennsylvania, New York and Ohio. Attempts are being made to apply newly developed educational technology to the design, conduct and evaluation of the instructional program. Included in this new technology are methods of defining educational objectives, drawing topical content for courses, preparing students in prerequisite knowledge and attitudes, individualizing instruction, measuring student achievement and establishing a system for evaluating program results in terms of outcomes following graduation.

In some school systems, experimental programs have been introduced. The Richmond plan is being conducted in high schools in Richmond, Calif. Subsequently, other school systems in California have inaugurated this program. Its target is the specially oriented student who often is experiencing academic difficulty in the general education program. The ultimate occupational goal of the Richmond program is the engineering technician. Modifications of the Richmond plan are directed to a variety of occupational goals. Curriculum units are planned by a teaching team around a core technical project provided by the industrial arts instructor. Each instructor in math, science and English structures his offering around that project stressing an interdisciplinary approach.

This project has demonstrated the effectiveness of such an employment-oriented approach in achieving a variety of occupational goals. About 40 schools in the San Francisco Bay Area have adopted the approach applying it to 12 different occupational goals.

One of the more interesting and successful programs has been Project Feast (Food, Education and Service Technology), which provides the student with training either for additional formal education or for immediate employment in the field of commercial food service. It also contains the features of cooperative work programs. By enrolling students of all ability levels, it has been especially effective and appropriate for those of less than average ability. Close liaison with the Hotel and Restaurant Foundation at San Francisco City College has assured both employment and further educational opportunities to the students involved.

An outstanding innovation in career guidance for high school students is the mobile career guidance trailer operated by the Solano County (California) Office of Education.

The purpose of the facility is to provide resources from which students can explore

career fields. A vocational advisor is on the trailer at all times when students are aboard. Students are given a brief orientation to the equipment in the trailer and are then free to explore. At the same time they are encouraged to consult the advisor for additional help.

The facility contains the latest equipment and materials. Career information is provided on microfilm and can be printed for students to carry away. Other materials and equipment include a table-talk projector with guidance film; a Fairchild projector with career cartridges, two tape recorders with interview tapes provided by Guidance Associates and a complete set of career information briefs from the California State Employment Service.

The technology for Children project co-sponsored by the New Jersey State Department of Education and the Ford Foundation, the Nova Schools in Florida, and the American Industries Project at Stout State University in Wisconsin are examples of programs that expose children early to the vocational choice they will eventually have to make. New Jersey's program consists of a systematic kindergarten through grade twelve view of the workings of the economy and the nature of the occupations within it.

The Nova (Florida) children in grades one to six are introduced to a wide range of employment-related experiences through tools, mechanical devices and games. The program becomes more specific in grades seven to twelve. In grades seven and eight, the students are introduced to fundamental concepts of technology. A variety of introductory experiences is provided to help the student become more aware of vocational alternatives and career requirements. Specialization increases in grades nine to twelve with encouragement constantly offered to remain in school as long as the student can profit from further education. All student experiences and decisions are intended to motivate the student in his educational achievement.

The American Industries Project begins in the eighth grade. The student is allowed to progress according to his ability to recognize and solve complex industrial problems within broad concept areas or clusters of concepts appropriate to the individual's interests and abilities from a general understanding of the major concepts of industry and technology and simple problem-solving techniques.

The Nova pre-employment program provides each student an opportunity to select one technological science course each year. Additionally he enrolls in science, social studies, English, mathematics and foreign language courses, each with units and activities directly related to the student's field of interest. Teaching the student concepts and processes of the work world and problem-solving techniques prepares him for current employment yet still enables him to cope with change.

The San Mateo Unified School District in San Mateo, Calif., has developed a "zero-reject" concept for curriculum planning. The assumption is that with proper teaching techniques every student can earn a high school diploma with a broad liberal and vocational education. It is the school's responsibility to see that students are employable whenever they choose to leave school, whether as a school dropout from grade ten or with a doctorate. Occupations are grouped into clusters and by levels that form ladders of progression throughout the entire educational system of the school district.

The Oakland (California) Unified School District has instituted a program for all seventh, eighth and ninth grade students in the process of career planning and development. This project, Choice or Chance, derives from a project funded under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 entitled Employment Readiness Activities. The in-



ment of both projects is to provide youth with a greater understanding of themselves and the opportunities available to them in the world of work. Emphasis is upon the data required for effective decision making. The Choice or Chance units have been developed as a cooperative counselor, teacher, student activity funded by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I. The program is incorporated into the English classes; the skill development is in the area of communications; the content is career planning.

It is this writer's contention that one can expect to see great improvements in work-experience programs as a result of the recently enacted Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. The amendments create a viable framework to equip young people with skills they must possess if they are to secure adequate employment. The implementation of the legislation can prepare students with a sound basic education that can be used as a foundation for further education and training should they decide to continue their studies.

The new legislation authorizes exemplary programs and projects to ease the transition from school to work. Provisions for intensive guidance and counseling as well as initial job placement are included. Programs in career planning can be undertaken as early as the sixth grade to acquaint students with the broad range of occupational opportunities.

Special provisions have also been made to assure adequate funding of programs for those individuals who have completed or left high school and are unable to study on a full time basis before entering the labor market. Beginning in fiscal year 1970, 25 per cent of the portion of each state's allotment in excess of its base allotment may be used for programs to enable these persons to prepare for good jobs.

The amendments can assist the states to expand their programs of work study, which by simultaneously combining education with work experience can teach students the value of learning a skill to get a good job. The amendments provide for 100 per cent federal financing for the states to hire personnel to coordinate such programs and to furnish instruction related to work experience. They also provide reimbursement to employers for certain costs they may incur while providing on-the-job training, and will pay the costs of providing other services, such as transportation of students participating in the program. The amendments also increase the proportion of federal matching funds that will be available under the work-study program from the previous 75 to 80 per cent.

Under the amendments assistance is offered to state and local educational agencies in the development of curriculums better adapted to the requirements of new and changing occupations, and in the dissemination of existing curricular materials.

The provisions of the 1968 Vocational Education Amendments, in short, will greatly strengthen this country's effort to help its youth find meaningful jobs.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITMENT TO END HUNGER IN THE UNITED STATES

**HON. ROBERT T. STAFFORD**

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, the President's commitment to end hunger in this land of plenty is a call for action we must respond to. He has pointed the

way—proposing a long-needed reform of our entire welfare system, and outlining an expanded food stamp program which would see that the poorest people receive food stamps free of cost.

Within its own sphere the administration has already acted. It has recognized Department of Agriculture food help programs—creating the Food and Nutrition Service specifically for this major job. Executive departments—such as Agriculture and Health, Education, and Welfare—have achieved harmony in working together to relieve hunger and malnutrition. The President has called a White House Conference on Food and Nutrition for December.

Congressional action is needed. Let us join and support the President in assuring that every American family will have a nutritionally complete diet. Let us eliminate hunger in America—now, and for all time to come.

#### HOW A BILL BECOMES A LAW

**HON. JEFFERY COHELAN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Dr. Claude Ury, of Berkeley, Calif., recently sent me an article on "How a Bill Becomes a Law" by Col. George F. Meyer and Lt. Col. John G. Garvin. This article presents an overall view of our legislative process. Periodically I am amazed at the lack of the public's knowledge of the Federal legislative system. Perhaps this article will lessen some of the popular misconceptions of the democratic process of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I include this article in the RECORD for the benefit of the readers:

#### HOW A BILL BECOMES A LAW

(By Col. George F. Meyer, Jr., USA, retired, and Lt. Col. John G. Garvin, USAF, retired)

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. . . ."—thus read the first two lines of every bill introduced in the Congress. To discover why this should be so one needs only to read Article I, Section 1, of the Constitution of the United States, which provides that:

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives."

Are you really familiar with this most important and historic document—the Constitution? How long has it been since you have read the Constitution from beginning to end? A week, a month, a year, 10 years—or have you ever read it? Whatever your answer, why not stop right now and read it? It won't take long—about 20 minutes—to read, including the 25 amendments.

Each year Congress takes action on thousands of legislative proposals. Although more than 25,000 bills and resolutions were introduced during the 90th Congress (1967-1968), less than 10% were enacted into law.

Proposals for legislation originate in many ways. A senator or a representative may introduce a measure he thinks is good for his district, his state, or the entire nation. The President may recommend legislation in his messages to Congress. An executive department or agency of the government may sug-

gest legislation. Or private citizens may urge their congressmen to enact certain laws.

Whatever their origin, such proposals share a common purpose: They seek to solve a problem faced by large numbers of Americans.

The legislative process begins with the introduction of a measure which may be either a bill or a resolution. Although a bill may originate in either body of the Congress, bills to raise revenue must originate in the House of Representatives, and bills to appropriate money, by custom and tradition, also originate in the House. In the Senate, a bill is introduced by a senator arising, being recognized by the presiding officer, and stating that he introduces a bill. He may or may not give a short explanation of what it is and what it is intended to accomplish. A bill is introduced in the House by dropping it into a box known as the "hopper." Only a member of Congress may introduce a bill.

Upon introduction, a legislative proposal is given a number. A bill, if introduced in the Senate, is preceded by "S," or if introduced in the House by "H.R." Thus H.R. 1 (91st Congress) was the first bill introduced in the House during the 91st Congress. The numbering continues through the second session and any special session if one is called. This bill designation continues to be used even after the measure has passed one body and is being considered by the other body. A bill introduced in the first session of a Congress may be considered during that session, or in the second, or in a special session. However, if it is not enacted into law by the close of a Congress, it cannot be acted upon by a later Congress unless it is again introduced.

A Public Bill is one of general application and, if enacted into law, becomes a Public Law. A Private Bill, often called a Relief Bill, affects only a person or a particular group or organization. However, in some cases, bills affecting only one or a few named persons have been designated as Public Bills.

In addition to bills, there are joint resolutions (H.J. Res. or S.J. Res.), concurrent resolutions (H. Con. Res. or S. Con. Res.), and resolutions (H. Res. or S. Res.). For the purpose of simplicity, we will confine this discussion to bills only.

#### CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

After the legislative proposal has been introduced and has become a bill, the next step is its referral to the proper committee. There are 21 standing committees in the House of Representatives, 16 in the Senate, and several joint standing committees of the two Houses, the most prominent of which is the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The members of a standing committee are appointed by the full body of each House, and the proportion of Democrats to Republicans on each committee generally is the same as the proportion of Democrats to Republicans in the full body. The House Committee on Rules, which has 15 members, is an exception to this proportionate representation, since two-thirds of its members are always from the majority party. The number of members of the other standing committees vary according to the nature of the committee. The largest committee in each House is the Committee on Appropriations with 24 members in the Senate and 51 members in the House. Some committees have as few as eight or nine members. Generally there are corresponding committees in the two Houses.

Most senators serve on two or more standing committees and may also serve on one or more joint committees. Due to the large membership in the House, many members serve on only one standing committee. Most committees have standing subcommittees. Special subcommittees are often appointed as the need arises. Invariably, the committee chairman is the member of the majority political party in that body who has the longest continuous service as a member of that committee.

An extremely important factor in the functioning of each Congressional committee is its staff, and the importance of the work of the staff members should not be underestimated. Each committee has a permanent staff and, when required, may have some temporary staff members. The professional staff of most committees is generally appointed on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliations. The clerical staff is also appointed by a majority vote of the committee. The committee staff analyzes each bill, requests reports from interested agencies and organizations, recommends which ones should have priority, briefs the committee members, often questions the witnesses during a hearing, prepares the committee report, and goes on the floor when the bill is being debated and to the conferences. However, they do not speak on the floor.

Committee action is undoubtedly the most important phase of congressional procedure. It is in this phase that a proposed measure receives detailed and intensive consideration and where the proponents or opponents of the proposal are given an opportunity to be heard. The tremendous volume of hard work done by the members and the staff of the committees is generally unknown to the public and is most often overlooked or at least misunderstood.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Congressional committee hearings may be legislative or investigative. A bill of sufficient importance, particularly if it is controversial, is usually considered by the committee in an "open" or public hearing. Legislative hearings involve a bill or resolution, whereas an investigative hearing is one in which a matter is being investigated to determine whether legislation is necessary. The latter is far more likely to receive the public attention as evidenced by the televised hearings of recent years which have almost all been investigative in nature. Notices of hearings are published in advance, and the testimony, for and against a bill, is recorded by an official reporter and is frequently published at the conclusion of the hearing. This transcript is in addition to the committee report.

Hearings may be held, first, by a subcommittee and later by the full committee. The subcommittee may vote to report the bill favorably to the full committee, with or without amendment, or unfavorably, or may suggest that it be tabled. Quite often the full committee only hears a brief report of its subcommittee and then votes to "favorably" report the bill to the floor of the body to which the committee belongs. A vote to table a bill is normally effective in preventing action on it.

You can see that the fate of the proposed legislation usually rests with the chairman and the members and staff of the subcommittee. It is here that all of the advanced preparation is tested. It is here that the proposal either succeeds or fails. It is here the witness becomes all important. As with any witness, his honest answers and the accuracy of his information are of prime importance.

If the full committee decides to report a bill favorably, a report must be filed while the House or the Senate is actually in session, unless unanimous consent is obtained to file at a later time.

#### ACTION IN THE HOUSE

Whereas committee procedures are similar in the two bodies, there are differences in the floor consideration, that is, consideration by the full body. Public Bills, if they involve, directly or indirectly, the raising of revenue, or appropriating money or property, are placed on the Union Calendar. The large majority of Public Bills are placed on it. Other Public Bills are placed on the House Calendar. Bills of a private character are placed on the Private Calendar which nor-

mally is called on the first and third Tuesday of each month. If a committee does not act on a measure after 30 days, any member of the House may move that the committee be discharged from further consideration of the measure, and the motion is placed on the Discharge Calendar. If a measure pending on either House or Union Calendar is of a noncontroversial nature, it may be placed on the Consent Calendar by any member of the House. This calendar is called on the first and third Monday of each month. If there is no objection, when a measure is called on the Consent Calendar, it is passed unanimously without debate. A measure on the Consent Calendar involving a million dollars or more is objected to automatically.

In order to expedite the consideration of bills and resolutions, the rules of the House require that all measures involving taxes, appropriations or authorizing payments out of appropriations already made must be considered by the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, before being acted upon by the House. Only 100 members, instead of the usual 218, constitute a quorum under this rule.

A special resolution or "rule" reported by the Committee on Rules fixes the length of debate by the Committee of the Whole. Upon the adoption of the "rule," the speaker appoints a chairman to preside over the committee and then leaves the chair. At the conclusion of debate on a bill, the Committee of the Whole rises and reports to the House and then the House acts on the recommendation of the committee. An interesting point in connection with this committee procedure is the fact that the mace is removed from its usual pedestal when the House resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. The mace (a bundle of 13 ebony rods bound with silver and surmounted by a silver ball on which stands a silver eagle with outspread wings), the visible symbol of government, is used by the sergeant-at-arms to preserve order. A spectator may determine whether the House or the Committee of the Whole is in session by observing whether or not the mace is on its pedestal to the right of the speaker. Another clue is the fact that the presiding officer is addressed by the members as "Mr. Chairman" rather than "Mr. Speaker" as is done when the House is in session.

There are two other ways of obtaining consideration of a measure by the House. On what is known as Calendar Wednesday (Wednesday of each week), the speaker calls the committees in alphabetical order, and a committee chairman may call up for consideration any bill on the House or Union Calendar which his committee has previously reported. A motion to suspend the rules may be made on the first and third Monday of each month and during the last six days of a session. It takes a two-thirds vote of the members voting, a quorum being present, to suspend the rules.

Prolonged speeches, known in the Senate as filibusters, are not possible in the House. An accurate account is kept of the time used for debate and when all the time used for debate and when all the time allowed under the "rule" has been consumed, the chairman terminates the debate. No member is permitted to speak more than once or for longer than five minutes regarding any proposed amendment.

After favorable action upon a measure, it is "engrossed" by the enrolling clerk, to provide an exact copy, including amendments, of the measure passed by the House. After favorable action by one body, a bill is then known as an "act." The Clerk of the House signs the engrossed copy, and it is delivered to the Senate in a traditional formal ceremony.

#### SENATE ACTION

An engrossed bill, or a bill originally introduced in the Senate, is referred to the appropriate standing committee, where it received

the same detailed consideration it had in the House. This procedure would be reversed if the Senate passed a measure and referred it to the House.

There is only one Calendar of Bills in the Senate. The Senate rules require consideration of the Calendar on every "legislative day." Therefore, the Senate quite often will recess rather than adjourn at the end of the day to obviate the necessity of calling the Calendar the following day. Thus the date line on a Congressional Record may show a "legislative day" several days or weeks prior to the actual date the Record is published.

Bills are considered at the conclusion of the morning business in the order in which they were placed on the Calendar. A senator is entitled to speak once and for not more than five minutes on bills that are not objected to. An objection to further consideration of a bill may be interposed at any time but upon motion the Senate may continue consideration after the Calendar call is completed, and the time limit on debate does not apply. On any day, except Monday, following the "morning business," any senator gaining recognition may move to take up any bill on the Calendar, regardless of its place on the Calendar. The motion to call a bill for debate is, in itself, debatable. There is no time limit on debate on the bill or on motion to call the bill, and the lack of any time limit may occasion lengthy speeches known as filibustering. Debate may be closed under the Cloture Rule—the famous Senate Rule XXII—if 16 senators sign a motion to that effect and the motion is carried, without debate, by two-thirds of the total membership of the Senate.

Whereas amendments on the floor of the House may be limited by the resolution of the Committee on Rules, there is no such limitation on the floor of the Senate.

#### CONFERENCE ACTION

If the Senate passes a House measure, or vice versa, without amendment, it is returned to the originating body, enrolled on parchment paper and forwarded to the President for his approval. It now becomes known as an enrolled bill. If the measure is amended by the other body, it is returned to the originating body with a request that it concur in the amendments. There is usually no objection to concurrence, if the amendments are minor in nature.

In the case of amendments of a substantial nature, the originating body may refuse to concur and request a conference with the other body. If there is no objection, conferees are appointed by both the House and Senate. Technically, only those portions of the measure on which there is disagreement may be considered, and the substantive amendments by the conferees are limited to the extremes of disagreement. However, the subject matter in conference may be greatly expanded if either body amended the bill by striking out all after the enactment clause.

The Senate conferees vote among themselves, as do the House conferees, with one final conference vote for each body on each question. Therefore the number of conferees from each body is unimportant. The measure, as agreed upon by the conferees, is reported to the House and Senate. It is usually adopted without objection, but if either body fails to adopt the conference report, the measure is defeated unless further effort is made to reach agreement. If the conferees cannot reach complete agreement, then in the body originating the measure, the amendments may be voted on separately and may be adopted by a majority vote, though no conference had been had with respect to the amendments.

The request for a conference can be made only by the body in possession of the papers, and this is significant inasmuch as the body asking for the conference has the advantage of acting last upon the report to be submitted by the conferees. One body, antici-



pating that the other may not concur in its amendments, may make a request for a conference at the time of sending the papers back upon passage of a measure with amendments.

#### PRESIDENTIAL ACTION

Article I, Section 7, of the Constitution, provides that:

"Every Bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it becomes a Law, be presented to the President of the United States; If he approves he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his Objections to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the Objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to reconsider it."

If each body approves the measure by a two-thirds vote after a veto, it becomes law without Presidential approval. If the President fails to approve or disapprove a measure within 10 days after it is presented to him (Sundays excepted), it becomes law without his approval unless the Congress, by adjournment, prevents its return, in which case it does not become law. The latter is known as a pocket veto.

The Supreme Court has stated that the President, when approving Bills, may be said to participate in the enactment of laws, which the Constitution requires him to execute.

The Constitutional requirement of a two-thirds vote of each body in order to override a Presidential veto gives the President considerable power and influence over the Congress. Except in times of unusual feeling or when a bill of extraordinary importance is involved, Congress has seldom passed a measure over the veto of the President. Much deference is shown by the Legislative Branch of the Government to the opinion of the Executive Branch, to which the Constitution commits a share of the law-making power.

#### PUBLICATION

The last step in the often lengthy, somewhat complicated, but extremely vital legislative process, is to make the law known to the people who are to be bound by it. After it is signed, the original Enrolled Bill is sent from the White House to the administrator of General Services for publication. There it is assigned a Public Law number. These numbers run in sequence for each Congress and, beginning in 1957, are prefixed by the number of the Congress, e.g., the first Public Law of the 91st Congress was designated as Public Law 91-1. Copies, called slip laws, are printed by a photoelectric offset process from the original Enrolled Bill and are available the next day. At the end of each session of the Congress, bound volumes, called Statutes at Large, are printed and contain the laws of that session.

It is hoped that this brief discussion of some of the many procedures and ramifications of the legislative process will help you to better understand and appreciate your Congress. It is a complex, but orderly system. The system works, and it works well.

#### IN SUPPORT OF CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

#### HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting measure will bring more public enlightenment and public enlightenment will help to solve some of our vexatious problems. We have plenty of problems that plague us. Public enlightenment brings relief—

relief is as refreshing as a cool breeze in the heat of summer.

Educational TV and radio has no ax to grind. It is free of prejudice or bias. It is free of ties to the advertisers. There is no need to pander to economic interests. Its only boss is the public. It takes no one off the air if it offends a customer or has a low rating. Culture and intelligence are the tests. It bends a knee to no one.

Commercial television has not provided the public with imaginative programs, nor given to the public programs leading to cultural growth and understanding. Regrettably, it underestimates the American viewer.

The TV channels and radio that are aided by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting are immunized from untoward interests.

We should support the CPB to the hilt. I personally support the CPB by my own personal contribution to channel 13 in New York.

We cannot be pinchpenny or parsimonious. We cannot be stingy. You know, the stingy are always poor. Being stingy with the Public Broadcasting Corporation would leave us poor indeed—poor in spreading the gospel of truth in news, fairness in editorial policy, honesty in comment and criticism of the operations of Government, and in the expansion of culture.

We cannot rely solely on private TV and radio broadcasting. If we did so, we would stumble and blunder.

The sum of \$20 million is asked for, to be distributed to the various public stations throughout the country during the fiscal year 1970, and \$15 million each year from 1971 through 1973. This is indeed an investment that will yield rich dividends.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY MORE SECURE?

#### HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about the plight of our senior citizens—many of whom have no source of income other than social security payments. Floods of letters from my older constituents outlining the difficulties they are encountering in trying to make ends meet have prompted me to introduce a bill which would raise social security benefits 15 percent and minimum payments 45 percent. In my October newsletter, I discussed this bill and other issues of interest to my constituents. I should like to share this mailing with my colleagues by including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### SOCIAL SECURITY MORE SECURE?

Social Security benefits would go up 15 percent under my bill, and minimum benefits would increase from \$55 to \$80 a month. Social Security has not kept up with living costs. A 73-year-old widow writes: "My only income is Social Security, \$111.40 a month. \$69 must pay the rent and they are going to raise that again. With doctor bills, there is nothing left." The House Democratic

Caucus has endorsed my proposal, and hearings by the Ways and Means Committee have just begun.

#### EAU DE BACK RIVER

Back River needs a new sewage plant. The present one has been smelling up the area for years. At my urging, millions of Federal dollars have been allocated. But construction won't be completed until after 1972. How to stop the smell in the meantime? Officials there promise me they will use deodorants on sludge at all times, instead of now and then. Will officials keep their promise? Use your nose! Every time the smell comes your way, call the plant (288-1585) and my office (828-6616). Keep the pressure on and we can end those odors.

#### SUPPORT YOUR LOCAL SCHOOLS

Baltimore County could get an extra \$1 million, Harford County an additional \$250 thousand, under a resolution sponsored by your Congressman to provide more Federal aid to schools and colleges.

#### BAN DDT

DDT kills insects and pests. But DDT is also a "hard" pollutant which does not dissolve with passage of time. Instead, it accumulates in crabs, fish, birds or other game. What will it do to people? Your Congressman's bill would ban production and sale of DDT.

#### GENERATION GAP—IT'S NARROWING

Students of Ridgely Junior High in Timonium suggested my bill to establish National Youth-Adult Communications Week. The bill passed. At a recent assembly, your Congressman presented the Presidential proclamation and pen to John Pennhellagon, one of the student leaders of Ridgely who lobbied for the bill.

#### CLEAN BILL OF HEALTH FOR EDGEWOOD

On my recent tour of Edgewood Arsenal, open-air nerve gas testing appeared to be conducted as safely as humanly possible. I got the Army to suspend tests, however, until my findings could be supported by a panel of civilian scientists which I asked the Secretary of the Army to appoint. Conclusions have not yet been published, but unofficial reports indicate this independent panel has given the tests a clean bill of health.

#### OFFICE ON WHEELS

Problem with the Federal Government? Want a law passed or repealed? Come to my Office on Wheels, Saturday:

October 25—Chase Post Office, 10 a.m.; Whitmarsh Post Office, 11 a.m.

November 8—Bel Air Post Office, 10 a.m.

#### TO OUR PRESIDENT

#### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, now that assessments are being made on the impact of the so-called Vietnam moratorium of October 15 and much is being written over the effect it will have on U.S. policy, I submit for the RECORD two pertinent articles.

The first is by the international correspondent of the Copley News Service, Dumitru Danielopol, which involves the format of an open letter to President Nixon which was carried in the October 14, Joliet, Ill., Herald-News.

The second is a column by Jeffrey Hart in the October 17 edition of the New World, a publication of the Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago.

The articles follow:

[From the Joliet Herald-News, Oct. 14, 1969]

DUMITRU DANIELOPOL: TO OUR PRESIDENT  
President RICHARD M. NIXON,  
*The White House,*  
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Don't feel lonesome on Wednesday—Vietnam Moratorium day—when anti-war demonstrators attack you and try to force you to do something you know is wrong.

There are hundreds of millions of people here in the United States and around the world who know that you are right. They know that freedom is indivisible, that it cannot accommodate tyranny in one corner of the world and survive in another.

People like myself whose birthplaces are now behind the Iron Curtain are wholeheartedly with you. We have learned about communism at first hand. Poles, Czechs, Hungarians, Bulgarians, Albanians, Romanians, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Yugoslavs, Ukrainians, Cubans, Chinese, Jews, Christians, Mohammedans—no matter what color, race or creed—we have suffered indiscriminately at the hands of the Communists. We know their ruthlessness and their perfidy.

The tens of millions who have taken refuge from communism in free lands stand by you.

We don't want to see what happened to us happen to the people of Vietnam, if it can be prevented.

And you know, and we know, that it can be prevented.

The great majority of native-born Americans back you, too, Mr. President, especially those sent overseas to fight the Nazis and the Fascists because governments in democratic countries in Europe in the 1930s failed to understand totalitarianism and failed to do what America is doing right now—stopping aggression while there is still time.

Every major national veterans organization in this country is on record in support of U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

No one wants to prevent free discussion, free opinion and even dissent—but on the condition that our rights are respected, too.

It seems incredible that so many people in high places advocate appeasement and the abandonment of a country fighting for its inalienable right to self determination.

Never in history have the aims of the Communists coincided with those of free people. Never have they voiced any policies that did not try to destroy freedom somewhere in the world. Yet today they seem to have so many articulate allies.

We know, Mr. President, that should the Americans abandon Vietnam—as the dissenters insist—America will cease to be the greatest country in the world.

There are times in the history of great countries and of great men when they have to stand up—even if alone—for what is right.

I witnessed some of those moments in the House of Commons when Winston Churchill tore his government and his party to shreds for the shameful Munich agreement of 1938. He was powerless, but he knew he was right.

From London, I heard Col. Charles de Gaulle, an unknown, call on his fellow Frenchmen, who had been shamefully defeated, to rally against overwhelming odds in the summer of 1940. He, too, was powerless, but he knew he was right.

Mr. President, you are in a much more favorable position than those leaders. You have the power, you have the time, for you are our President and our Commander in Chief, and you have an arsenal that can bring an honorable conclusion in Vietnam.

And, Mr. President, you have us on your side. We don't march or demonstrate, but that doesn't mean we aren't ready to help you.

Sincerely,

DUMITRU DANIELOPOL.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

[From the New World, Chicago (Ill.), Oct. 17, 1969]

MORATORIUM IMPLAUSIBLE: STUDENTS DO NOT  
MAKE U.S. POLICY

(By Jeffrey Hart)

The nation's colleges and universities held their so-called Vietnam Moratorium Oct. 15, organized by the old student workers who backed Gene McCarthy—principally Sam Brown and David Hawk.

The war is, of course widely unpopular, and most students feel, at best, that it is esoteric; and a good many undergraduates welcomed an excuse to cut classes for respectable reasons.

A number of my own students, of all moods and all shades of opinion, have questioned my attitude toward the Moratorium.

I find that the symbolism of the whole thing was, to say the least, unanalyzed. Is it plausible for an anti-war student to say, in effect: "President Nixon, I am against this war, and unless you end it forthwith, I will cut one class in English 39?"

And then, to escalate, as the Vietnam Moratorium committee has posited, cutting an additional class for every month as war goes on: "President Nixon, the war has now gone on a whole year since the moratoria began, and so I am now going to cut 12 sessions of English 39."

Nixon's only possible reply is the one he gave, and for which he has been roundly criticized. As far as the Vietnam Moratorium is concerned, he doesn't care.

The foreign policy of the United States is not made on the campuses; it is not even made in English 39.

It is made by the elected representatives of the people, preeminently President Nixon; and if the campus proletariat—as Theodore White calls it in his latest book—chooses not to attend classes for a day or for 500 days, well, that is their business.

I do think it is a fault on the part of the administration that the course in Vietnam for the next couple of years has not been spelled out.

As the war now stands, people are not sure how long it is going to last, whether it can be won, or if it can be won, how much winning it might cost.

The widespread uncertainty is demoralizing, and, even more important, gives demagogues an opening to exploit. Nevertheless, the outlines of the administration's policy are now tolerably clear.

During the next year or year and a half, about half the American troops will be withdrawn. That will leave about a quarter of a million Americans in Vietnam; but these will be for the most part in supporting roles—supply, logistics, aviation, and the like, as well as specialized combat troops operating closely with Vietnamese units.

With a shift in tactics away from search and destroy to an in-depth defense of populated areas, the bet is that the communists can be prevented indefinitely from achieving any important or lasting success.

Meanwhile, though the fighting will go on at a reduced level, American losses will drop. In addition, only volunteers—professional soldiers rather than draftees—will be used in Vietnam.

It is very difficult to see how an effective opposition to this strategy can be mounted. Surely no large segment of American opinion actively desires to see the communists in control of South Vietnam, slaughtering those who have cooperated with us.

When the direction of American policy becomes clear, the leftist protesters here will lose many of their allies; and this is the reason why both the President and Senator Scott have called for a moratorium on divisive criticism. It is also the reason why the hard left is escalating its criticism.

The left does not think that Nixon's policy is implausible; it thinks that it is only too plausible; and that it will in fact forestall a communist victory in the South.

CERAMIC TILE INDUSTRY FEELS  
SHARP IMPACT OF HOUSING  
CRISIS: TEMPORARY RELIEF  
SOUGHT

## HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the shortage of available mortgage funds and other long-term credit has had and is having a drastic effect in curtailing and postponing the construction of residential dwellings and commercial buildings normally subject to mortgage financing.

This drop in housing starts, according to a spokesman for the National Association of Home Builders, has placed the housing industry in "the most urgent crisis it has experienced in the past quarter of a century."

In August of this year, the rate of housing starts had dropped 30 percent to a level of 1.3 million units and Secretary of Housing and Urban Development George Romney has stated he fears it will drop further to below the 1-million level.

The decline in the market has had a severe impact on the ceramic tile industry. This is due to a couple of seasons: First, because a majority of the industry's production goes into new home construction and second, because the problem is heightened by the nature of foreign competition to which this industry has been subjected.

Foreign imports of ceramic tile are presently at an alltime high and account for over one-third of the total market. These importers have an increasing share of these sales through a number of predatory practices that would constitute statutory violations if engaged in by U.S. manufacturers.

Such practices weakened and damaged the industry to a point several years ago that a Treasury Department investigation forced the Japanese to take corrective measures. By that time, however, some companies had passed the point of no return, and in the 1966 housing collapse, 13 plants closed their doors.

At the present time, a giant British tile cartel is waging a massive dumping campaign. Through the use of this predatory practice, it has doubled its share of the U.S. market in the past year.

"Dumping" involves sales in the United States below the home-market price with the objective being penetration and rapid expansion of the importers' share of our market. Past history has shown that once dumping has driven plants out of business, an increase in the price of the foreign product usually follows. What initially appears to be a break for the consumer, results in a higher price later following the destruction of domestic firms.

The Bureau of Customs is currently investigating flagrant violations of U.S. laws by the British ceramic tile manufacturers. Incidentally, the largest British firm is now 15 times as large as the average American tile company—the result of a recent merger designed to facilitate more rapid exploitation of the U.S. market.

As a result of the current housing market contraction, foreign importers



are also reaping further gains due to a shift in the nature of the type housing being built. Last year, for the first time in history, apartment units represented more than 50 percent of residential construction, and it is in apartment construction that the foreign manufacturer finds its most receptive market.

There is a clear and present danger that manufacturing plants throughout the country will be forced to reduce their operations or close their doors with a resulting loss of jobs and investment.

In my own State of Texas, for example, ceramic tile companies employed 483 workers in 1968 with a payroll of \$2,009,000 and total sales of \$6,124,000. Assuming an income multiplier of 2.5, the total economic benefit to Texas would be in the order of \$15,310,000, but because of import competition, these companies used only 62 percent of their capacity. At full capacity, it is estimated that the total economic benefit would be over \$20 million.

Mr. Speaker, there is an alternative—a means of supplying temporary relief to this beleaguered, old and established industry which consists largely of small independent firms. That is through the bipartisan support of the concurrent resolution I introduce today.

This resolution, which has already been introduced by 21 of my colleagues in the House expresses the sense of Congress that, in the current period of monetary restraint, the executive branch using its existing authority should take steps to prevent injury to U.S. industries and to offset undue competitive advantages accruing to firms and industries in foreign countries engaged in exporting to this country, through voluntary reduction in ceramic tile imports until such time as these restraints are removed and free market conditions are restored.

Last year, this House passed the Housing and Urban Development Act. It established a national housing goal of 26 million units over the next decade.

If this goal is to be attained, then America must have strong and viable firms to supply the products such a program will demand. I believe that the ceramic tile industry's call for a temporary and equitable offset of the advantage presently enjoyed by the foreign manufacturers merits the careful consideration by each Member in this body.

If we close our eyes to the real peril with which this industry is now confronted, there is the distinct possibility that an increased portion of American homes will bear the mark "Made in U.K." or "Made in Japan."

#### WOMAN BUSINESS AGENT SELECTED BY LARGEST UNION LOCAL IN UPPER MIDWEST

**HON. DONALD M. FRASER**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I recently learned that in early October, Honeywell Teamster Local 1145 chose a new busi-

ness agent. Newspaper announcements of similar news seldom appear on the women's page. In this case, the news did because the new union official is Mrs. Peg Miezwa, a friend of mine and an employee of the Honeywell concern for 28½ years.

Local 1145 is the largest union in the upper Midwest. It has over 12,000 members, and I am proud to count many of these members as constituents. I look forward to working with Mrs. Miezwa on matters of importance to her union, the company she works for, and the district.

A feature article which appeared in the Minneapolis Star (October 10, 1969) points out that "Women business agents are so rare that none of the officers interviewed could recall hearing of another one in any large union of mixed membership." This is unfortunate, because women comprise an important and growing segment of our working population. I hope that this great reservoir of talent, working women, will more frequently be tapped for union leadership. This would then become another area where unions lead the way in progressive social change.

The Minneapolis Star announcement by Susan Abbasi of Mrs. Miezwa's selection follows:

#### FEMALE BUSINESS AGENT IN HONEYWELL UNION CALLED BREAKTHROUGH

When Honeywell Teamsters Local 1145 appointed Mrs. Peg Miezwa business agent last week, it was a big advance in the status of women within the union, according to several of the organization's officers.

"This really represents a breakthrough in unions, and it's symbolic of changes all over the country," declared Mrs. Marie Nagengast, recording secretary and executive board member. "This is the largest union—more than 12,000—in the Upper Midwest, and it's big news among Teamsters, too."

There are two women on the seven-member executive board, elected by a membership which is 50 percent female. Elected in 1968, they are the first women to hold the top positions.

Because business agents are responsible for negotiating grievances with management for union members, the matter of who holds the position is a matter of personal concern for the membership, Mrs. Nagengast said.

#### WOMEN AGENTS RARE

Women business agents are so rare that none of the officers interviewed could recall hearing of another one in any large union of mixed membership.

"Even when most of the members are women, they usually have men as the agents," said Mrs. Dorothy Provost, the other female executive board member.

A business agent is appointed by the secretary-treasurer—presently a man, James Gorman—and ratified by the membership. In Mrs. Miezwa's appointment, the ratification vote was very close, but close votes for business agents are the rule, the officers agreed.

Ed Wages, executive board member, said, "Men are finally realizing women have qualifications to hold important positions, and they are now voting on qualifications of the person, not on sex."

In the 1968 elections, when the first two women, Mrs. Nagengast and Mrs. Provost, took their positions on the executive board, there was a big swing toward more liberal attitudes, all agreed.

#### TREND TO RIGHTS

"It's the trend of the times," Wages said. "There's more realization of everybody's

rights everywhere, and this is naturally part of what's happening in the unions."

Both the women and Wages expressed pride in their union for the interest and participation that has brought more women into the leadership.

"We're really proud of our local for recognizing the fact that women have their place in the higher positions," Mrs. Provost said.

"It's the most progressive and democratic union I've been in, and I've been in several," Wages declared.

Wages acknowledged that his own attitudes toward women in union leadership have changed a lot.

"I was really hard-core for men in the leadership until my wife had to help out when I was injured once. Now she's working to help support our family, and I can see women as serious full-time workers now. I think if they have the qualifications, they should have the same chance as the men at all the union positions," he said.

Mrs. Miezwa began working at Honeywell 28½ years ago. She immediately became active in union affairs; two years ago she was appointed full-time staff aide, working for the union.

Mrs. Nagengast, a factory worker at Honeywell the past eight years, is enthusiastic about the response of both men and women, but feels there is a long way to go. "That's another big advantage in Peg's appointment," she declared, "She will be sort of a model for the other women to take themselves seriously as workers."

#### AMERICA WANTS A TIMETABLE FOR A VICTORIOUS PEACE

**HON. CHARLES A. VANIK**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, few in America have been so persistent and as consistent in advocating a cessation of the hostilities in the Vietnam conflict than Harry Volk who is editor-in-chief of the Sun Papers of my congressional district. His articulate and compassionate arguments for peace date back to the very beginnings of this dreadful conflict. To his credit Mr. Volk has not given up his fight and continues to write clearly and concisely on this vital subject. I concur with Mr. Volk that an immediate ceasefire should be ordered in Vietnam. I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial Mr. Volk wrote for the October 16 edition of the Sun Papers. This fine editorial is as follows:

[From the Sun Press, Oct. 16, 1969]

#### AMERICA WANTS A TIMETABLE FOR A VICTORIOUS PEACE

(By Harry Volk)

Yesterday's nationwide Vietnam Moratorium, in which millions of students and other anti-war demonstrators took part in relatively peaceful protest, should underline for President Nixon that a victorious pursuit of peace in Vietnam is what this honorable nation demands.

The Moratorium, unique in American history, should have made clear to the President that the nation wants all of our troops out of Vietnam in a definite schedule of withdrawals.

President Nixon, unfortunately said on Sept. 26, in commenting on the Moratorium, that "under no circumstances will I be affected whatever by it." These must be hard words to swallow today but swallow them he must.

Half-measures such as "token" withdrawals and the meaningless numbers game as far as draftees are concerned are no longer acceptable. A total of 291,000 men have been drafted this year to date as compared with 296,000 last year. Obviously, there has been no real reduction in the number of young men called into service.

Yesterday's Moratorium also underscored the fact that although the Moratorium began as a student protest it embraced civic, religious, education, labor, and political leaders of both parties, plus millions of just ordinary men and women, who believe we had no business getting into the war in the first place and feel there is no moral justification for our presence there now.

President Nixon, whatever may have been his disdainful rhetoric prior to the Moratorium, could not fail but be impressed by the sincere, deep yearning for peace in Vietnam that manifested itself yesterday throughout the length and breadth of this land.

We are certain that President Nixon wants peace, too, but he must pursue it with a timetable of troop withdrawal that says clearly to South Vietnamese leaders that the war is going to be completely their war by a certain, fixed date.

There is nothing like a deadline to force action and our involvement now needs a termination date. Otherwise the war will continue to drag endlessly as it has since we made our first meager commitments in a calamitous military mistake eight long years ago.

We hope President Nixon's address to the nation Nov. 3 will include a dramatic offer to Hanoi for a cease-fire in Vietnam as a prelude to peace. At least we should offer to stop the needless slaughter while our nation pursues a victorious peace.

That takes moral courage, Mr. President.

#### THE NATIONAL STUDENT MORATORIUM ACTIVITIES

### HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the national student moratorium activities were peaceful and that so many people participated throughout the country. I saw a recap of the day's activities on television on October 15, and noticed that there was no mention of the involvement of high school students.

My own daughter is a high school senior at the National Cathedral School for Girls, and I know and witnessed the sincerity of the girls at that school as they sought ways in which they could also be a part of this witness to peace. The school did not permit official recognition of this moratorium, however after much negotiation girls who wished were allowed to participate in a chapel service given by the chaplain at the counterpart school for boys, St. Albans.

The girls issued a special publication on the moratorium, and I submit a few articles for this:

#### THE VIETNAM MORATORIUM

(By Mr. Curran)

During this past week, several students have dropped by my office to discuss the October 15 Moratorium. I have listened to many points of view and many interpretations of the present Vietnam situation and what we should or should not do. I think it is im-

portant for you to know the stand of the school in regard to this day.

First of all, let me reiterate that a school's primary obligation is to its students and their education. The student body in a school such as N.C.S. is varied, and individuals represent a variety of positions on major issues—political and otherwise.

Now, the Vietnam war and the present debate on this subject are not simple matters. We are dealing with a most complicated and complex issue—one that is a major concern of this administration as well as past administrations. A high school (and we are also an elementary school) is committed to its primary role of education and is not meant to act as a proponent to one side of another in a political debate. Obviously, the subject can and will be discussed within the framework of the classroom and certainly the individual student can feel free to observe this day as she wishes before or after school.

Your position in this situation is a personal and individual matter. If you, as an individual, feel passionately committed to participating in this day by staying away from school, then go ahead. But know that in so doing you are making a decision, and with your decision, you must be prepared to take the risks that go along with commitment.

If you are excused from school by a note from your parents (as for a doctor's appointment) you may be absent from classes. If you choose to cut without an excuse handed in ahead of time, then your cut will be considered an unexcused absence from school and treated accordingly.

As adults you are asked to make many decisions. Let your conscience guide you in making yours and when you have made it, act as an individual and try not to criticize others for having decided differently. Do not condemn your school, or your parents, for not making your decision for you. We are here to serve all of you.

#### VIETNAM: THE AMERICAN COMMITMENT

United States involvement in Vietnam finds its beginnings in 1954, when it refused to be a signatory of the Geneva Agreements. In this action, which was, in part, a result of the hysteria created by the McCarthy era, the U.S. was joined only by South Vietnam. The other members of the Geneva Conference, including Great Britain, France, the U.S.S.R., Red China, North and South Korea, Cambodia, and Laos, signed the Agreements in an attempt to restore and guarantee peace in Indochina.

Although the Agreements were essentially an acknowledgement of France's surrender at Dien Bien Phu to the forces of the Viet Minh, or alliance for independence, the United States regarded most of the provisions of the treaty as a "surrender to Communism". Consequently President Eisenhower could only ensure United States respect for the treaty, not consummate acceptance. Therefore, it was without apprehension that, in January of 1955, the United States began to render direct assistance to the government of South Vietnam, headed by Ngo Dinh Diem.

Since President Eisenhower's decision in October of 1954 to grant assistance to the South Vietnamese, the United States has steadily increased both its human and technological contributions; that is, until June of this year, when President Nixon announced the beginning of a phased withdrawal of American troops from Vietnamese territory. During the Kennedy Administration, U.S. assistance coagulated into involvement in the actual combative conflict between North and South Vietnam. However, it was during the Johnson Administration that we became inextricably emmeshed in the conflict.

With the adoption of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution by Congress in 1964, the United

States became legally involved in the war. The Resolution was proposed after two U.S. Navy destroyers were reportedly attacked by North Vietnamese torpedo boats. Although no flotsam or jetsam were found as proof of wreckage, the Congress voted overwhelmingly in favor of the Resolution, which condemned Communist naval units in Vietnam for "deliberately and repeatedly attacking United States vessels lawfully present in international waters, therefore creating a serious threat to international peace." Senator Morse of Oregon and Senator Gruening of Alaska were the only voting members of either house of the Congress who opposed the adoption of the Resolution.

The Gulf of Tonkin Resolution was not a formal declaration of war on the North Vietnamese. Although U.S. retaliatory bombing raids were part of the military reaction to the attack, no U.S. aggression was advocated. Rather, the resolution authorized the President to use his constitutional discretionary powers to "take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Defense Treaty." The date of termination of the treaty was not determined, leaving the decision up to the President, or future concurrent resolution of the Congress. To this date, the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution has not been revoked.

Consequently, until Congress repeals the Resolution, it is the responsibility of President Nixon to put an end to the merciless slaughter of millions of men. And it is our duty as Americans to see that that end is reached. For it is too late to mourn over our mistakes at the Geneva Convention fifteen years ago or over Congress' hasty adoption of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution in August of 1964. The people of this country must now unite to show our leaders that prolonged and arbitrary involvement in Vietnam will not be tolerated. We must demonstrate our willingness to accept the burden of humiliation so that we may make a positive contribution to the goal of international peace, which the Geneva Conference labored to attain. For, as John Kenneth Galbraith writes: "to continue to invest in error is the only unforgettable mistake."—Wenry Mink.

The purpose of this handbill is not to advocate the idea that people are obligated to protest the war or even go to other colleges and universities to hear speakers, attend seminars and participate in various demonstrations. As the D.C. Moratorium coordinator explained, "We don't want students to leave classes on October 15, but we urge high school administrators to suspend classes in the afternoon and keep students on campus to conduct a day of inquiry." This request appears quite reasonable, but since at Cathedral, we are not to be permitted any way of expression our opinions (in either direction) in terms of what is being planned at other high schools and colleges in the Washington area and around the country, those concerned must act independently of the school. Individuals do have the opportunity to become involved in the following activities which will hopefully provide some answers and raise many more questions.—Debby Van Dyken.

The Vietnam Moratorium, and, on a larger scale, other anti-war demonstrations have been criticized on several grounds.

The critic who upsets me the most is someone who says, "I'm only one person—what can my involvement do? My part in the Moratorium, or the Moratorium itself—are they really big enough to be important?" If this issue is what is at question, then so is the whole principle of democracy—the voice of the people. If you do not feel involvement as a single component in a complicated structure, why vote, why care? Obviously the democratic system in our gov-



ernment is ineffective, or this demonstration would be unnecessary. But only in asserting your extra-governmental power as a citizen can you regain your due power.

Another question asked is, "Why get involved in the Moratorium until you know it's going to be really effective, a success?" My answer to this is: If there is no doubt or uncertainty, there is no question, and if there is no question, there is no solution.

Obviously, the issues at stake meet with diversified opinions, and this is a good thing. But a truly unbiased position for any institution permits vocalization of all these opinions. Some people think that the Vietnam War is an evil, immoral thing, and that the U.S. troops should withdraw immediately—some don't. But it is unfortunate that in order to express her opinion against the war the student needs to adopt an anti-administration stand as well. We are trying to make progress, not trouble.—Ashton Appplewhite.

The War Moratorium is an important issue for many students. I cannot honestly share their sentiments, pro or con, and therefore can take no active part in the October 15 demonstration. I am not well enough informed on the reasons for U.S. commitment in the war to condemn the present policy. Also, I have no immediate contact with the war. I believe Nixon is doing his best to pull out our troops and end the fighting. I am also sympathetic to the protesters' cause and think they have every right to express their views. I would like to be an observer, remaining open to both sides of the issue.—Dede Doyle.

The price we pay for principles is  
Neither worth its weight in gold.  
Nor its toll in bodies,  
We fight proudly as if  
Something were really at stake  
Besides split blood.

Oh, America!  
The judges sit appalled for they know all  
Whom they judge must be heralded murderers:

We are in blood up to here . . . and  
Even our newborn babies are steeped in corruption,  
for blood is the way of the world . . . ?

From blood we have come, to  
Blood we shall answer and  
The thick red charisma shall crust slow  
Slide up to our dishonest elbows and for this  
We must never blame the communists  
Oh, America!

For the soul of America—in our haste—  
Falls from dust to atoms. From  
That which in our hearts says: "no"  
We turned without a word  
Lifting gleaming swords to the stars . . .  
The Peace we await with this war's end  
Will not come.

ARNETT HOLLOWAY.

#### A TIME FOR CHOOSING

**HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER**  
OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, in a time when crime is rampant and America's values are threatened, I wish to suggest the following article to those of us who will be making decisions on vital issues and to the man on the street who is affected by them.

It was written by the Reverend Robert G. Eppler, pastor of Christ Covenant

CXV—1928—Part 22

Church, Louisville, Ky., for the October issue of the Badge—official publication of the Jefferson County Fraternal Order of Police, Louisville, Ky.

The article follows:

#### A TIME FOR CHOOSING

(By Rev. Robert G. Eppler)

"And Elijah came unto all the people, and said, How long halt ye between two opinions? if the Lord be God, follow Him: but if Baal, then follow him." First Kings 18:21

The Constitution of these United States represents one of the finest gifts a wise and benevolent God could grant His people. Divinely conceived and nobly perpetuated, this sacred document is designed to ensure our citizens those self-evident truths of "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." Perhaps it was inevitable that modern-day barbarians assault this bastion of social and political freedom. Today, it has become the favorite refuge of hardcore revolutionaries, unwashed hippies, pot smoking "love children," academic weird-os, predatory politicians and liberals so blind, they should not be allowed on the streets without a seeing eye dog.

Each day brings news of campus riots, rebellion, hoodlums terrorizing innocent women and children, anarchists openly planning the burning and looting of America. I, for one, have had it! When will decent, God-fearing, law abiding citizens of this afflicted land rise up and shout, "Uncle Sam! Enough is enough!" When are YOU going to rebel against this insane, absurd, mind-sapping nonsense that masquerades as social reform?

The time has come for a New Revolution of the "silent middle"—an uprising of indignant people—people who are fed to the gills with punks, malcontents, beatniks, peaceniks and just plain scum, all dedicated to overthrowing the land we love. Let there be a call to arms . . . to hearts and minds that are willing to oppose this despicable tyranny. Let there be a nation-wide demonstration of Parent-Power, aimed directly against those who seek our destruction.

Brethren, the times are out of joint! The cart is before the horse. Common sense must once again prevail. When I, as a lad, disobeyed my father he did not negotiate with me concerning my constitutional rights! Justice was swift and sure, applied to the true seat of learning, where it did the most good. I am grateful that I, like many others, absorbed those stern lessons of discipline and obedience. The bedrock of law and order was never in doubt: God, my father and the paddle. I quickly learned to love the first two and to respect the last. Perhaps a public flogging might cool the ardor of someone bent on depriving us of our civil rights.

The so-called "Generation Gap" is merely a fictitious gimmick, a deadly instrument devised by our enemies to divide and conquer us. In truth there is no "Gap," only widespread confusion as to the role adults and parents should play in this permissive society. The fault lies with willful parents who pander to the insatiable appetites of those young people who are hopelessly spoiled, pampered, ego-centered. Arrogant, vulgar, lacking in elementary courtesies, often unwashed, unsaved and terribly alone, these youngsters indict our generation by their hostility and contempt. Far too many of them have been abandoned by parents who lack the intestinal fortitude to set up guidelines, impose discipline and say "No!" with finality. Where there is no leadership in the home, no firm moral commitment, no strong sense of right vs wrong, children lose confidence in their parents, while love and respect give way to sneering condemnation.

The important battle for our children's minds and souls, is being lost by default. More and more of today's young people rally around the Pied Pipers who speak with authority. Tragically the loudest voices in the

land cry rebellion, lawlessness, indulgent sex, drugs, etc. We have only ourselves to blame for those in the present generation who have degenerated into spineless, sheeplike, brain washed flower children. Into these hands the future of our country—a country presently under all-out attack by a ruthless foe—must inevitably fall! It's a sobering thought.

Over stimulated and undereducated, with moral values significantly blurred, they are easy prey for highly trained Communist agents, systematically planning their cold-blooded destruction. An entire generation of American youth destroyed, for their nefarious purposes. The final irony? When and if the Marxist possess this precious land they will immediately ban the indiscriminate use of drugs; rock music, pornography, etc. Why? Because they will have served their purpose—the total corruption of our youth.

How long will you tolerate this treachery? It is no longer a question of believing in this group or that society. You have now but to awaken to the awesome dimension of the treason confronting you.

You who love God, your family and your country. You who earn your daily bread by sweat of brow and toll of hands; you who stagger under the ever-increasing burden of confiscatory taxation; you who are bled white by predatory politicians and led astray by "socialist workers" posing as ministers; and by churches that long ago sold their souls to Satan . . . how long will you endure?

Brethren, it is time to choose sides! It is time to rout the intruders from our streets, homes, governments, schools and churches. What this country needs is an old fashioned back-to-God revival! We need to fall on our knees in repentance and rise to our feet in righteous anger . . . and drive the rascals out. From the rat-infested Berkeley Campus to the dishonored halls of Harvard; from the far reaches of the North to the Southern shores where Soviet submarines even now lurk beneath the waters . . . we are compromised. The enemy is in our midst!

Let us appeal then to the good, the intelligent and the Divine that is within us. With a prevailing faith in the power of a sovereign God to overcome, let us resolutely repossess our land. Brethren, like Elijah of old, we must this day choose sides.

#### FEDERAL PAY BILL

**HON. MORRIS K. UDALL**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, with House passage of the 1969 Federal salary bill, H.R. 13000, several newspaper articles have shed additional light on the important subject the House debated last week.

John Cramer, perceptive columnist for the Washington Daily News has written a clear and concise article on the real costs of the bill and on Friday morning the New York Times reported that two New York City postmen have filed for welfare support because of their low salaries. I want to share these two articles with my colleagues because I believe they fairly state the need for H.R. 13000.

The two articles follow:

[From the Washington Daily News, Oct. 17, 1969]

NIXON FIGURES ON UDALL BILL MISLEADING  
(By John Cramer)

The Johnson Administration, as I was wont to report from time to time, wasn't above

using misleading figures to combat proposed federal employee pay raises it considered excess.

Now we have the Nixon Administration doing the same thing.

In an effort to head off the Udall federal pay bill (H.R. 13000) President Nixon Tuesday sent a "Dear Jerry" letter to Minority Leader Gerald Ford, R-Mich.

In it he said, without any qualification whatever:

"In its present form H.R. 13000 would add approximately \$4.3 billion a year to federal expenditures. It would balloon expenditures in the remainder of the fiscal year by \$1.5 billion."

There is no quarrel with the second sentence.

#### MISLEADING

Even the first is technically correct. But it is highly misleading.

It clearly leaves the impression that the Udall bill would cost us taxpayers \$4.3 billion annually which otherwise would be saved.

That simply isn't the case.

The Udall bill, if accompanied by proportionate increases for military personnel, would indeed cost \$4.3 billion in fiscal 1971, the new government year which begins next July 1.

#### COST ALMOST AS MUCH

But what the "Dear Jerry" letter didn't say was that the President's own pay proposals would cost almost as much.

By official Budget Bureau figures the Udall bill would cost \$371 million more than the President's proposals in fiscal '71. That's no small sum. It's well worth attention of a President with inflation problems.

But it's a far cry from \$4.3 billion!

By official budget figures, the eventual extra cost of the Udall bill would top \$1 billion annually. But again, it's not \$4.3 billion.

The extra cost in the Udall bill would come mainly from what the President described as its "disproportionate benefits" for postal employees:

By budget figures, a two-step within-grade raise for postal employees in the first 11 grades, retroactive to Oct. 1, would add \$338 million to fiscal 1971 expenditures.

Again by budget figures, a speed-up in postal within-grade promotions, effective July 1, would add \$33 million to the fiscal-71 budget.

But after eight years, this speed-up would be costing almost \$800 million.

Add the \$338 million to the almost-\$800 million and the President had every reason to tell "Dear Jerry" that the Udall bill "eventually" would add \$1.138 billion annually to federal expenditures.

But that still isn't \$4.3 billion. And it can't possibly come out that way.

The MAJOR part of the \$4.3 billion comes another way. It comes from the concept originated in the Eisenhower days, first implemented in the Kennedy years, supported by President Johnson, endorsed by President Nixon, that federal pay rates (civilian and military) should be "comparable" to national average private rates.

In harmony with this concept, the Nixon Administration's own pay proposals were presented to the House Civil Service Committee June 17 by Civil Service Commission Chairman Robert Hampton.

In dollar content, they differed from the Udall proposals only in two ways:

First—no "special" raises for postal employees.

Second—a slightly slower approach to the "comparability" pledged by Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon.

Mr. Hampton proposed:

A raise next July to bring postal and classified (white collar) employees to the national average private enterprise level of June, 1969, as developed by the 1969 Bureau of Labor Statistics survey of private rates.

A second raise, early in 1971, to bring them to the private level of June, 1970. Mr. Hampton suggested this second increase take effect "as soon as practical" after the end of the 1970 BLS survey. He left no doubt that he meant raises in the first half of calendar 1971, and falling within the fiscal 1971 budget.

By contrast, the Nixon attacked Udall bill proposed a raise next January to bring employees to the June, 1969, private level; a second raise, a year later, to bring them to the June, 1970, private level.

The difference there is small . . . a matter of timing. Here, too, the Udall bill would add a certain amount to the fiscal 1971 budget. But it would not thereafter effect the annual "federal expenditures" mentioned in the "Dear Jerry" letter.

It takes incredibly big money these days to payroll the federal establishment—something more than \$40 billion annually, civilian-military combined.

But nothing is gained by dealing in phony figures.

That's the stuff "credibility gaps" are made of.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 17, 1969]  
TWO MAILMEN POINT TO PAY AND ASK RELIEF

(By Francis X. Clines)

Two letter carriers applied for welfare yesterday to demonstrate that under the present day scales young family men can qualify for relief in the form of income supplementation.

Labor leaders of the letter carriers, accusing President Nixon of reneging on a campaign promise to increase postal salaries, said that as many as 3,500 of the 50,000 postal workers in the metropolitan area already received partial welfare aid.

The two postmen, James W. Warden, a father of three, and Victor Irizarry, a father of six, said they took home \$100 or less each week in salary. They joined the relief application line at the Department of Social Services center at 260 West 30th Street, behind a young woman holding an infant.

"It's a damn shame that New York has to subsidize a Federal employee because the Government is not paying people a living wage," Gustave J. Johnson, president of the New York Letter Carriers, declared.

#### \$6,167 TO \$8,440 PAY

Mr. Johnson said he encouraged other letter carriers to "swallow their pride" and apply for aid. The pay scale, ranging from \$6,167 to \$8,440 after 20 years, is so low, the labor leader asserted, that hundreds of carrier jobs are vacant in the city and many carriers are exhausted from having to work at two jobs.

Economists have estimated that scores of thousands of city residents are paid so low that they qualify for supplementary relief of hundreds of dollars a year. Most have never come forward, fearing the scorn of fellow workers, according to welfare officials.

In the past, leaders of low-paid workers' unions have shied away from emphasizing relief eligibility to their lower-paid members. But Mr. Johnson said he had acted after receiving word from Washington that a bill to raise postal salaries by \$412 a year would be vetoed by the President.

Representative Gerald R. Ford, the Republican minority leader in the House indicated this week that the Administration strongly disapproved of a pending Federal pay raise bill contending it would contribute to inflation.

#### DECISIONS PENDING

Ten other carriers were scheduled to join their colleagues in seeking welfare, but some were delayed by the opportunity for overtime and others hesitated at the last minute, according to Mr. Johnson.

The two who applied were referred to another center to obtain proper application

forms, and they hoped for a decision on their eligibility today.

Supplemental aid is available to a full-time worker if his gross salary minus taxes, insurance, pension and work-related expenses is less than the standard welfare payment, according to a spokesman for the Department of Social Services.

In the case of Mr. Irizarry, his latest week's take-home pay was \$93.87. The deductions from his gross salary of \$122.73 included \$8.40 in taxes, \$7.97 in pension payments, \$5.92 in health insurance and \$2.88 in life insurance.

"I got carfare in my pocket, that's all," he said.

If the Irizarry family were jobless and entirely on welfare, it would receive a total of \$508 a month from the city, including its rent of \$125. This is \$133 more than the letter carrier now takes home each month.

A Social Services Department spokesman estimated unofficially that a family such as Mr. Irizarry's might, be entitled to this \$133 difference plus work-related expenses such as carfare.

Among the points to be investigated, the spokesman said, would be any liquid assets held by the family, which would be deducted from the formula.

#### A WIDER AUDIENCE

### HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, educational television is finding a growing audience for its excellent programing. But it too has its critics.

These critics have charged that educational television presents elitist fare with appeal to a narrow, intellectual audience. To survive, of course, ETV must find a wider audience.

It has heard this criticism and is now embarking on a wider range of programing for two reasons. First, it has recognized that it can provide genuine service if it broadens its program spectrum. Second, by drawing the interest of a wider audience it hopes to hold this audience for its more traditional programing.

If this experiment is successful, the lie might be put to the view that the commercial demands of most television, and these are legitimate demands not to be lightly dismissed, will not sustain a higher level of programing.

Recently, Rex Polier, the television critic of the Philadelphia Bulletin, the distinguished evening newspaper in my city, discussed one technique educational TV is employing.

With the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I enter Mr. Polier's column in the RECORD:

HOW-TO PROGRAMS BOOM ON EDUCATIONAL STATIONS

(By Rex Polier)

The "How-To-Do-It" programs are to educational TV what the Westerns and situation comedies are to commercial stations.

"I guess you could call them our Beverly Hillsbillies," a Channel 12 executive reflected the other day. He was looking over a long list of "how-to-do-it" series that have given the station a loyal and vocal audience since 1964.

Commercial TV offered instructions in



home repairs, gardening, and other areas early in its history. But most of these fell by the wayside as competition in programming increased.

The non-commercial channels were left with an almost open field for this inexpensive, yet very helpful, type of programming. Since almost every non-commercial channel of any size in the country produces at least one such series, and they exchange them freely with each other without cost, there is always an abundant supply.

Julia Child is the prototype and most successful of educational TV's how-to people. Her following on Channel 12 set a record for the station. Appeals for support and offers of her cookbooks, tied in with the show, still bring a large viewer response. The surprising thing is that her shows, which originate in Boston, have been in re-runs for the past two years. She hasn't made a new one in all that time, but says she plans to when she completes a book she is now writing.

Another very popular series is Channel 12's own production of TV Garden Club featuring Swarthmore botanist and horticulturist Roy Kersey. It is seen on Fridays, 7:30 P.M. Kersey, a colorful, personable man who enjoys a large following hereabouts, draws approximately 5,000 letters weekly asking for resumes of his lectures. The program's switch to color recently and its inclusion on the Pennsylvania Public TV Network, has increased its audience.

Kersey, who began his TV career originally on WFIL-TV, is No. 1 on the garden set hit parade. The Philadelphia Flower Show offered Channel 12 a free booth last year if Kersey would agree to appear at it and meet the public. He has even had an African violet named after him.

Another popular series, and one that always draws a big response whenever it is rerun, is Nine to Get Ready. It consists of 12 half-hour programs conducted by Dr. J. Robert Bragonier dealing with pre-natal care.

Two series of instructions on the folk and classical guitars brought thousands of requests for an instructional booklet that was used. A 13-week program in color which featured skiing instruction by some of the nation's top experts, attracted an ardent following.

Channel 12 has in its library similar series on antiques, auto mechanics, home repairs, everyday electronics and even chess. The chess series, featuring an expert named George Koltonowski, drew a small but terribly intense audience. Currently, a Pittsburgh bridge expert named Jean Cox is offering weekly instructions in that game and an attractive Chinese-American named Joyce Chen has an enthusiastic following for the Chinese cooking instructions she gives on Tuesdays, 7 P.M.

#### MEDAL OF HONOR AWARD

### HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, on October 16 the President of the United States awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously to Sp3c. Edgar E. McWethy, Jr. of Baxter Springs, Kans. His parents, Mr. and Mrs. Edgar Lee McWethy, Sr., received the medal at White House ceremonies from President Nixon.

In being awarded the Medal of Honor, Specialist McWethy has performed the greatest service to his Nation that he could.

The Medal of Honor is awarded in the name of Congress to a person in the

armed services who distinguishes himself conspicuously by gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his own life above and beyond the call of duty while engaged in an action against any enemy of the United States. The deed performed must have been one of personal bravery or self-sacrifice so conspicuous as to clearly distinguish the individual above his comrades and must involve risk of life.

Specialist McWethy, who deserved to live, gave the greatest sacrifice he could to his country. I feel it is fitting that his citation be inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### CITATION

The President of the United States of America, authorized by act of Congress, March 3, 1863, has awarded in the name of The Congress the Medal of Honor posthumously to Specialist Five Edgar L. McWethy, Jr., United States Army, for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty:

Serving as a medical aidman with Company B, 1st Battalion, 5th Cavalry, 1st Cavalry Division (Airmobile), in Binh Dinh Province, Republic of Vietnam, on 21 June 1967, Specialist McWethy accompanied his platoon to the site of a down helicopter. Shortly after the platoon established a defensive perimeter around the aircraft, a large enemy force attacked the position from three sides with a heavy volume of automatic weapons fire and grenades. The platoon leader and his radio operator were wounded almost immediately, and Specialist McWethy rushed across the fire swept area to their assistance. Although he could not help the mortally wounded radio operator, Specialist McWethy's timely first aid enable the platoon leader to retain command during this critical period. Hearing a call for aid, Specialist McWethy started across the open toward the injured men, but was wounded in the head and knocked to the ground. He regained his feet and continued on but was hit again, this time in the leg. Struggling onward despite his wounds, he gained the side of his comrades and treated their injuries. Observing another fallen rifleman lying in an exposed position raked by enemy fire, Specialist McWethy moved toward him without hesitation. Although the enemy fire wounded him a third time, Specialist McWethy reached his fallen companion. Though weakened and in extreme pain, Specialist McWethy gave the wounded man artificial respiration, but suffered a fourth and fatal wound. Through his indomitable courage, complete disregard for his own safety, and demonstrated concern for his fellow soldiers, Specialist McWethy inspired the members of his platoon and contributed in great measure to their successful defense of the position and the ultimate route of the enemy force. Specialist McWethy's profound sense of duty, bravery, and his willingness to accept extraordinary risks in order to help the men of his unit are characteristic of the highest traditions of the military service and reflect great credit upon himself and the United States Army.

#### THE MORATORIUM

### HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 15, 1969

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, today millions of Americans, from every walk of

life, are interrupting the daily routine of their lives to discuss the greatest issue in our national life—the war in Vietnam. From the smallest hamlet to the halls of the Congress, concerned citizens are participating in an unprecedented national dialog.

For too long, I feel, the war debate has been confined to extremists on both sides. As President Nixon pointed out in his inaugural address, those who shouted the loudest held the center of the stage, while rational, reasonable arguments too often were lost in the tumult.

But, as we saw in the House Chamber last night, this time it is different. What we heard there—and what is being heard all across the country—is not the voice of ideological radicals spouting mindless slogans. Nor the voices of the self-centered, self-styled "revolutionaries" who have dominated the headlines so much in recent years, but concerned men and women, aware of the complexities of the issue, and trying to reach honest and practical judgments as to what course the country can take to get out of the present unsatisfactory situation.

This kind of activity is not the great "fall offensive" that Hanoi would like to believe. Rather, it is a manifestation of something uniquely American—the right, and indeed the obligation, in a democracy for all citizens to participate in the search for solutions to great national problems. This is as it should be—for the success or failure of those policies intimately affects their lives, their children's lives, and history as well.

Those who say that the sole effect of this activity is to strengthen Hanoi are missing the whole point. Hanoi can believe whatever it wants to about the aims of the moratorium. But I think that this kind of activity can strengthen America, more than Hanoi. It will make more people aware of the realities of the situation, and of the options open to us. In the end, I hope, it will make many people much more sympathetic to the position of the President. And from this dialog, I hope, will come a sense of direction in this Nation—not one imposed from above, like the totalitarian unity of the North Vietnamese, but a genuine, majority agreement on our ends and goals. And that majority view, I believe, will not be too much at variance with the position of this administration.

The administration, as we know, has reacted to the idea of a moratorium with a great deal of trepidation, if not outright hostility. And considering the history of antiwar demonstrations, that is a reasonable reaction. Too often the extremists have taken over such demonstrations, and the far-out discord has been both embarrassing and damaging. But this movement today is more broadly based, and so lacking in rigidity, that I feel the administration has very little to lose by it, and indeed has much to gain. For when reasonable men look at the facts of the matter, in a calm and understanding atmosphere of realism, they will almost certainly find themselves supporting most of what the President has done, and wants to do. They may conclude that he should move faster in one direction or another, and I think

that he will, take that advice with good grace. As the Washington Post said recently, the President himself is a "charter member" of those who want peace. He has much in common with those who are walking around the White House tonight with lighted candles, and I think that by the end of the day both he and they will know it.

# NATIONAL BUSINESS WOMEN'S WEEK

## HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, on the calendar of designated weeks, we have reached National Business Women's Week.

While the proliferation of special weeks has prompted light comments, this designation is a dignified and well-established one. It seeks to cast a spotlight on the contribution of career women to community and national achievement by their effective and expanding service in business and the professions.

More than 3,800 Business and Professional Women's Clubs will be participating this week in Congresses of Career Women Leaders.

In recent years, there has been accelerated progress in the matter of equal employment opportunity for women, and the Congress has assisted in this. The recognition of the capacities of well-trained women to assume responsibilities at high levels in our complex, technological economy has spread across the higher echelons of business management.

At the same time, the ladies see much more as needed to be done in this regard, and I am sure their programs of the week will not be spent in self-congratulation—although feminine superachievers will be honored.

In pursuing the objective of a rewarding existence for all citizens, including the enjoyment of the advantages of improved education, health services, housing and the myriad conveniences of our advancing technology, it is important that the nation have the advantage of every talent—of every individual ambition.

In education, we are seeking to "train up" to maximum capacity our young people without regard to sex, race, or economic situation of the parents. Our goal in this has not been reached, but remarkable progress has been made.

The value of attaining the goal will be debased significantly, however, if the trained-and-ready young citizen of either sex, or of any ethnic background, is not welcomed into the professional and business mainstreams of the national economy.

Beyond this, there must be continuing recognition of the principle of career advancement on merit, without prejudicial inhibitions.

National Business Women's Week should serve to remind us of this.

# CHAVEZ AIMS PLEA AT HILL

## HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on the 1st of October, my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA), invited members of the Education and Labor Committee, and Members of the House who had sponsored farm labor and occupational safety and health legislation to a public meeting to discuss these and related problems with Cesar Chavez, director of the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, AFL-CIO.

It was a remarkable meeting. Held in the main hearing room of the Committee on Education and Labor, the meeting attracted 19 Members of the House, and a standing-room-only crowd of spectators. The Members present were by no means of one mind about Cesar Chavez and his cause, and the discussion was vigorous and not always wholly amicable. In my judgment, this may have been one of the most useful hearings I have ever attended in this field of public policy.

In yesterday's Washington Post, there appeared a story by Frank C. Porter, giving his impressions of the meeting, and of Cesar Chavez. I include the story at this point in the RECORD:

CHAVEZ AIMS PLEA AT HILL—GRAPE BOYCOTT LEADER SHOWS HIS CHARISMA

(By Frank C. Porter)

There he sat, Cesar Chavez, saint or devil depending on one's viewpoint, looking like a little boy after a bout with the flu.

Sitting in a low-slung rocking chair prescribed by Dr. Janet Travell, his head and shoulders barely rose above the witness table.

His characteristic red lumberjack shirt (Chavez refuses to dress other than as the campesinos he leads) struck a note of incongruity in the opulent Rayburn Building hearing room.

Once stocky, his legs had become thin and he looked almost emaciated the result of recurrent illness compounded by back trouble since his 25-day fast last year in protest against the cult of machismo and stirrings toward violent action within his United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, AFL-CIO.

Flanking him at the witness table were Jerome Cohen, UFWOC's counsel; Andy Imutan, Filipino-American and a vice president, and Mac Lyon, a black organizer. Only Cohen wore a coat and tie. It was possibly the most ethnically diverse panel ever to grace a congressional hearing.

Except it wasn't really a hearing. It was, in the words of Rep. James G. O'Hara (D-Mich.), a "public meeting" to which House members interested in the plight of the farm worker had been invited.

It was also a study in the charisma Chavez radiates, a charisma which his enemies concede makes him a formidable foe and which they charge tends to distort or obscure the issues in dispute.

There was no question about the frankly adulatory partisanship of the gathering. In addition to the almost universally sympathetic representatives ranged about the double tier of committee seats, the room was packed with worshipful supporters mostly

youngsters, a few hippies but mostly freshly scrubbed, straight-looking college kids.

O'Hara himself set the tone. He introduced Chavez as "a great American, a great labor leader, a truly good and gentle man but a man who is as controversial as any figure to blaze across our skies in decades. He has made bitter enemies, and some of us love him for the enemies he has made. He had made devoted friends, and some of us are honored to be among those friends... There are very few neutrals where Cesar Chavez is concerned."

The deceptive innocence, the compound of his unwrinkled features, betrayed no pride in the extravagant praise. Chavez went on to tell once again the story of the five-year campaign to win bargaining rights for California grape pickers.

Most of the congressional audience had heard it before—old admirers such as O'Hara and Reps. Philip Burton (D-Calif.), Ogden R. Reid (R-N.Y.), Roman C. Pucinski (D-Ill.), William D. Ford (D-Mich.), and John H. Dent (D-Pa.). But they sat rapt.

Chavez went into the question of racial diversity, how once growers used it to pit worker against worker, how now there are even camps of Arab and Portuguese fieldhands in California. "It takes a long time to get them to learn to live together," he said.

He renewed his charges of non-cooperation of Federal and state agencies on such problems as illegal migrant workers and pesticides. "It's impossible to deal with them."

He gently mocked the organizational efforts to circumscribe his power through such groups as the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Right-to-Work Committee, the John Birch Society and even the Mothers Against Chavez and the Mexican-American Democrats for Republican Action (MADRA).

He said the contracts UFWOC had won from a dozen wine grape firms are working well. And the nationwide table grape boycott would not have been extended to all California growers had not UFWOC's primary target, Guimarra Vineyards, borrowed some 50 different labels from its competitors, he explained.

He said UFWOC's big objective is simply recognition. And he again condemned the Congress for failing to extend to farm workers the guarantee of organizational and bargaining rights accorded industrial workers for more than 30 years.

He said that a 350 per cent increase in California grapes bought by the Defense Department for its troops in Vietnam over the past year or so is the biggest reason 10 maverick table grape growers broke off negotiations with the union in late June. (South Vietnam is now the third biggest grape importer in the world, he said; it used to be 27th.)

When Chavez finished and his lieutenants had had their say, the questioning began. The queries were friendly, mostly supportive of Chavez's argument or adding favorable points he had not touched upon.

They were sympathetic, that is, until it came the turn of Rep. William J. Scherle (R-Iowa).

Scherle, a tough but amiable giant of a man who grows grain and livestock in Iowa and is one of the House's more outspoken no-nonsense conservatives, gave it to Chavez.

He ridiculed Chavez's contention that pesticides are affecting the health of a majority of California's farm workers. He uses pesticides extensively on his farm, Scherle said, never uses gloves even and never has suffered the slightest symptoms from them. Neither have any of his friends or neighbors, he said.

In rebuttal, Cohen cited what he said were Food and Drug Administration figures showing 80,000 to 90,000 injuries a year from pesticides and 800 to 1,100 deaths.

Scherle challenged whether the grape



pickers were so downtrodden after all. "Some of these people are making \$95 a week" he said. "What more can you give them?"

Chavez's youthful supporters in the audience hooted with derisive laughter.

Pucinski attempted to intervene on Chavez's behalf. "You're no farmer and you can't talk about agriculture," Scherle told the Chicagoan. Later Pucinski said "I don't think he (Scherle) has held a handful of dirt for a long time."

Scherle suggested Chavez and the union are attempting to deny the right to work to California fieldhands. "Is this your supreme effort—compulsory unionism?" he asked.

"I think a union shop is a good arrangement," Chavez replied. He said that under UFWOC contracts there have been only eight or 10, all Anglos, who didn't want to join. They were exempted, he said, and allowed to contribute the \$3.50 a month in dues required by the contract to the Red Cross or other charities.

(Earlier this year Chavez argued that farm unions be permitted to negotiate closed shops, barred under present law, in order to catch up to their industrial counterparts. A union shop requires membership by some specified time after a worker is hired. A closed shop requires that the worker be a member before he is hired.)

When it was over, it was quite apparent Scherle had not changed his ideas. Nor was there any evidence that anyone else in the room had changed his mind.

What this unorthodox and highly partisan meeting did indicate was that, regardless of the arguments, the biggest obstacle California growers have to overcome is the magnetism of Cesar Chavez.

#### ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF LEYTE

### HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, at 10 o'clock on the morning of October 20, 1944, American troops went ashore on the island of Leyte, Philippine Islands. This began the decisive battle which was to continue for over 4 months, and the defeat of the imperial Japanese forces. The architect of the campaign was that great soldier and statesman, Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

A constituent and friend of mine, Mr. Edward D. Speakman, of San Antonio, Tex., served in the Leyte campaign. He was then 19 years of age. During the course of a patrol he came across a leaflet which had been air dropped to the Philippine people just prior to the landing on Leyte. It was retained by the finder.

It appears that few copies of the leaflet have survived through the past 25 years. Mr. Speakman has furnished me with a copy of it. It would seem that on this, the 25th anniversary of that historic landing it is appropriate to include the contents of that leaflet as a part of my remarks. This historic proclamation issued by General MacArthur follows:

PROCLAMATION OF GENERAL HEADQUARTERS, SOUTHWEST PACIFIC AREA, OFFICE OF THE COMMANDER IN CHIEF, TO THE PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES

I have returned. By the grace of Almighty God our forces stand again on Philippine

soil—soil consecrated in the blood of our two peoples. We have come, dedicated and committed, to the task of destroying every vestige of enemy control over your daily lives, and of restoring, upon a foundation of indestructible strength, the liberties of your people.

At my side is your President, Sergio Osmena, worthy successor of that great patriot, Manuel Quezon, with members of his cabinet. The seat of your government is now therefore firmly re-established on Philippine soil.

The hour of your redemption is here. Your patriots have demonstrated an unswerving and resolute devotion to the principles of freedom that challenges the best that is written on the pages of human history. I now call upon your supreme effort that the enemy may know from the temper of an aroused and outraged people within that he has a force there to contend with no less violent than is the force committed from without.

Rally to me. Let the indomitable spirit of Bataan and Corregidor lead on. As the lines of battle roll forward to bring you within the zone of operations, rise and strike. Strike at every favorable opportunity. For your homes and hearths, strike! For future generations of your sons and daughters, strike! In the name of your sacred dead, strike! Let no heart be faint. Let every arm be steeled. The guidance of divine God points the way. Follow in His Name to the Holy Grail of righteous victory!

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR.

#### MAYORS, GOVERNORS SEE LIGHT—ASK NAMES BE REMOVED FROM POSTAL CORPORATION LOBBY

### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform the House that the so-called Citizens Committee for Postal Reform is foundering. It is already down by the stern and sinking from the weight of its own bilge despite the frantic efforts of big business to bail it out.

A number of the key members of its crew, including many mayors and several Governors, have already abandoned ship. Others have apparently elected to go down with the two captains who sweet-talked them into signing on in the first place. I predict, however, that others will change their mind before the final plunge.

I had not planned to call attention to this minor tragedy on the high seas of fat-cat finance in the belief that the "committee" deserved the dignity of a quiet departure. But the shrill distemper of its hired hands, having found their way into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, cannot remain unanswered.

#### ABOUT THAT PRESS RELEASE

We are indebted to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI), for the insertion in the RECORD on October 3 of a press release from the so-called committee which—had it not been so published—obviously would never have been published anywhere.

The target of this so-called press re-

lease was my equally good friend Pat Nilan, the national legislative director of the United Federation of Postal Clerks, AFL-CIO, who had earlier accused the "committee" of "hoodwinking" scores of mayors and Governors into supporting the administration's Postal Corporation scheme without full knowledge of what is involved.

Mr. Nilan had the temerity to suggest that the cochairmen of the committee, former Postmaster General Lawrence O'Brien, and former GOP National Chairman Thruston Morton, failed to specify in their original letter of invitation that the body was being created with the support of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to lobby for a Postal Corporation as such.

#### WHO MISLED WHOM?

Mr. Nilan further accused Messrs. O'Brien and Morton of "outrageously misleading the Nation's mayors by claiming that postal reform would make a billion dollars a year available for urgent social purposes"—a pledge that I am sure the Members of this House will view with great interest.

In response to these documented charges, a Mr. James J. Marshall, described in his own press release as the committee's public affairs director, cried out that Mr. Nilan's remarks were—among other things—fallacious, irresponsible, intolerable, atrocious, reckless, false, highly insulting, ridiculous, incredible, preposterous, astounding, curious, ludicrous and above all serious.

Mr. Marshall, who obviously would never be caught in public without his Thesaurus, was long on objectives but strangely short on rebutting Mr. Nilan's factual charges that "at least two Governors and six mayors have asked that their names be removed from the letterhead of the Citizens Committee for Postal Reform." Instead, Mr. Marshall demanded "a full public apology from Mr. Nilan."

#### APOLOGIZES FOR UNDERSTATEMENT

I can now report to the House, after consulting with Mr. Nilan, that he is happy to make a full public apology for understating the facts. Mr. Nilan now tells me that the actual total of resignations from the committee has in fact risen to at least three Governors and nearly a dozen mayors.

The committee, for example, lists as one of its sponsors the Honorable Richard J. Hughes, Governor of the great State of New Jersey.

Yet under date of August 12, 1969, on the letterhead of the Governor of New Jersey, the following letter was received by John R. Napurano, president of the New Jersey State Federation of Postal Clerks:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,  
Trenton.

DEAR MR. NAPURANO: Thank you for your letter regarding my position on the bill to place the United States Post Office Department in the hands of a public corporation, H.R. 11750.

Unfortunately, I believe you have been misinformed, as I am not a member of the Committee on Postal Reform. In any case,

the decision rests completely in the hands of the Congress, and as you are surely aware, it is beyond the jurisdiction of a Governor.

I am pleased, however, to have received the information you have provided on the issue, and I consider myself better informed as a result of your understandable error.

Thank you for having taken the time to write.

Sincerely,

RICHARD J. HUGHES,  
Governor.

When Mr. Nilan charges that the committee has been hoodwinking Governors and mayors if not the public itself it seems to me that something more than a long string of adjectives is required to explain letters like the foregoing.

The committee's hired hands use up a great deal of space abusing Mr. Nilan but they never quite come to grips with the fact that many of the Nation's leading mayors have in fact actually quit the committee just as Mr. Nilan has pointed out.

For the sake of the record I am going to include here the text of several other letters from former members of the committee which tell their own story without benefit of adjectives:

STATE OF MAINE,  
Augusta, Maine, August 21, 1969.

MR. CLAUDE J. DESAUTELS,  
Executive Director, Citizens Committee for Postal Reform, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DESAUTELS: In recent months, I have had an opportunity to study the proposal advanced by Postmaster Blount for the creation of a government-owned corporation to handle postal matters, and H.R. 4 introduced by Congressman Dulski to reform the postal system.

After careful consideration, I must conclude that, of the two alternatives, Congressman Dulski's proposal is more desirable. Therefore, I request that my name be removed as a member of the Citizens Committee for Postal Reform. I apologize for any inconvenience I may have caused you.

Sincerely,

KENNETH M. CURTIS,  
Governor.

Finally, I should like the record to show that Mayor James Brennan, of Somerville, Mass., has recently been defeated in a reelection bid and can no longer officially represent his community on the committee.

In pointing out these facts it is my hope that the committee will not also accuse me of fallacious, irresponsible, intolerable, atrocious, reckless, false, highly insulting, ridiculous, incredible, preposterous, astounding, curious, ludicrous, or even serious misrepresentation. Indeed, the real danger is that their rhetoric may soon be reduced to a burp.

Here are some of the other "interesting" letters from top executives:

CITY OF MIAMI, FLA.,  
August 21, 1969.

MR. CLAUDE J. DESAUTELS,  
Executive Director, Citizens Committee for Postal Reform, Inc., Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DESAUTELS: After giving the matter of serving on the Citizens Committee for Postal Reform, Inc. further consideration, I am requesting that my name be withdrawn as a member of this Committee effective today.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN P. CLARK,  
Mayor.

CITY OF LYNN, MASS.,

July 25, 1969.

CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR POSTAL REFORM, INC.,  
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: In response to your letter of June 18, 1969 seeking support for what was described as a system which would "give this country the most efficient and economical postal service in the world and will give the postal workers the opportunity to realize their full potential," I sent to you permission to use my name. Subsequently it has come to my attention this assent has been used to indicate support of a particular bill; such certainly was not my intention.

I remain anxious that postal service be improved, and that postal workers be provided full opportunity to realize their full potential. To do both requires working conditions in which the morale of the postal worker is assured by the fairness of the system itself.

It is my understanding that the Citizens Committee for Postal Reform, Inc. is sponsoring a specific bill which precludes an effective view for postal employees. In the light of this, will you kindly remove my name from the list of those who endorse your present activity.

Very truly yours,

IRVING E. KANE,  
Mayor.

STATE OF MAINE,

Augusta, Maine, September 29, 1969.

MR. PATRICK J. NILAN,  
Legislative Director, United Federation of Postal Clerks, AFL-CIO, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. NILAN: Thank you for your letter of September 26 and the enclosed copy of the official publication of the United Federation of Postal Clerks.

I have studied the contents of H.R. 11750 and H.R. 4 sponsored by Representative Dulski. After this study, I decided that H.R. 4 was the more desirable bill. I therefore requested that my name be withdrawn from the Citizens Committee for Postal Reform, Inc. I am no longer a member of that Committee.

Sincerely,

KENNETH M. CURTIS,  
Governor.

CITY OF FALL RIVER, MASS.,  
October 1, 1969.

MR. PATRICK J. NILAN,  
Legislative Director, United Federation of Postal Clerks, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you very much for your letter of September 26th.

After talking with postal clerks, carriers, postmaster, and attending the Postal Forum in Washington, I agree with you; and as of last week I sent in my resignation as a Director on the Committee for Postal Reform. Your letter may have been late, but the postal employees in this district are working well and have proved their point.

Sincerely,

NICHOLAS W. MITCHELL,  
Mayor.

CITY OF FALL RIVER, MASS.,  
September 24, 1969.

CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR POSTAL REFORM, INC.,  
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Thank you very much for the honor bestowed upon me to be a director of the new postal reform.

I attended the Conference in Washington on September 8th and 9th and enjoyed listening to both of you. In fact, all the speakers had a message to convey. From reading, listening, and seeing certain things, I feel at this time that I would best serve you by resigning from the directorship. I don't feel I can give the time, the effort or whatever else is needed to help you in your search for a better service.

I feel the Postal Service is just such a serv-

ice to the people of the United States, and I hope that you and your committee in your judgment devise a way which will be helpful to the mailers, the clerks, the carriers and everyone having anything to do with the service.

Again, thank you for choosing me. I am sorry that I cannot be of any more service to you. Kindly remove my name from the list.

Very truly yours,

NICHOLAS W. MITCHELL,  
Mayor.

NEWARK, N.J.,  
August 12, 1969.

MR. JOHN R. NAPURANO,  
President, New Jersey Federation of Postal Clerks, West Orange, N.J.

DEAR MR. NAPURANO: This will acknowledge your letter of August 3, 1969, with regard to the listing of my name as a member of the Committee for Postal Reform. I am sorry this happened. Unfortunately, I did not know all the facts concerning this bill, and have written to the Committee asking that my name be removed.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely,

HUGH J. ADDONIZIO,  
Mayor.

CITY OF NEW BEDFORD, MASS.,  
October 1, 1969.

MR. PATRICK J. NILAN,  
Legislative Director, United Federation of Postal Clerks, AFL-CIO, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have revised my position of advocacy to H.R. 11750. I have withdrawn from the Citizens Committee for Postal Reform. I have advised the membership of your local union of my position, and it has been carried in their publication.

I took these courses of action several weeks ago.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely,

EDWARD F. HARRINGTON,  
Mayor.

CITY OF BETHELEHEM, PA.,  
September 30, 1969.

UNITED FEDERATION OF POSTAL CLERKS, AFL-CIO,  
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Thank you for sending me the material expressing your views on the merits of H.R. 4 as opposed to those of H.R. 11750.

I believe the enclosed copy of my recent letter to the Citizens Committee for Postal Reform will clarify my position.

Sincerely,

H. GORDON PAYROW, Jr.,  
Mayor.

SEPTEMBER 26, 1969.

CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR POSTAL REFORM,  
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Many months ago I joined your group in a spirited effort to bring about efficiencies and economies in our U.S. Postal Service.

After reviewing H.R. 11750 and H.R. 4, I find that H.R. 4 will do as good a job, and possibly better, in bringing about postal reform than your sponsored legislation. My main concern is the protection of postal employees which is provided in H.R. 4.

I have also discussed the merits of both bills with our local postal employees. It appears to me that after H.R. 4 is passed a sincere effort should be made to provide the real efficiencies we need in our postal service.

By this letter I ask that you remove my name as a sponsor of the Citizens Committee for Postal Reform.

Sincerely,

H. GORDON PAYROW, Jr.,  
Mayor.



SALT LAKE CITY CORP.,

Salt Lake City, Utah, September 10, 1969.

Mr. JOHN VOSS,  
President, United Federation of Postal  
Clerks, Temple, Tex.

DEAR Mr. VOSS: I sincerely appreciate your taking the time to write me as you did recently regarding the proposed postal reform.

This is to advise you that I have asked that my name be withdrawn from the postal reform committee.

Sincerely yours,

J. BRACKEN LEE,  
Mayor.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,  
Scranton, Pa., October 3, 1969.

Mr. PATRICK J. NILAN,  
Legislative Director, United Federation of  
Postal Clerks, AFL-CIO, Washington,  
D.C.

DEAR Mr. NILAN: Thank you for your letter of September 26th.

I am enclosing copies of my letters to Lawrence F. O'Brien and Thruston B. Morton, National Co-Chairmen of the Citizens Committee for Postal Reform and Mr. Nicholas Shyshuk, Vice-President, of the United Federation of Postal Clerks of Pennsylvania, presenting my views on H.R. 11750 and H.R. 4.

Sincerely,

JAMES J. WALSH,  
Mayor.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,  
Scranton, Pa., July 18, 1969.

LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN,  
THRUSTON B. MORTON,  
National Cochairmen,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MESSRS. O'BRIEN AND MORTON: Since joining your committee in the early part of June, I have had an opportunity to check some of the pending legislation for congress concerning postal reform.

As you stated in your letter, the objective of the Citizens Committee is the active support of legislation which will give this County the most efficient and economical postal service in the world, and give the postal worker the opportunity to realize their full potential.

I have made the following decision:

The two major pieces of legislation for postal reform are H.R. 11750 and H.R. 4. I would like you to know that I believe that H.R. 4 is the most acceptable bill before Congress to bring about needed reform. It appears to provide the machinery for the necessary physical improvements; and at the same time, it gives some degree of protection to the employees of the postal service.

Since I volunteered to join this committee, I felt it incumbent on my part to let you know how I felt concerning the two pieces of pending legislation.

Sincerely,

JAMES J. WALSH,  
Mayor.

STATE OF NEBRASKA,  
Lincoln, July 30, 1969.

DONALD J. URWILLER,  
Editor, Nebraska Postal Clerk,  
Hastings, Nebr.

DEAR Mr. URWILLER: Thank you for your letter in which you discuss the planned Postal Corporation.

As of this date, I have not been advised as to a meeting of the Postal Reform Committee; therefore, I doubt if much will come out of it.

You have certainly demonstrated in your letter that you know a good deal more about the Postal Corporation plan than I do, and simply because I have consented to appear on the Committee does not necessarily mean that I endorse wholeheartedly the concept of the Corporation.

I can assure you that I am interested in some postal reform in order to remove as

much of the political patronage aspect of it as possible. There are inequities in the postal system and it would be my hope that these would be changed.

I guess what I am trying to say is that I doubt if you and I disagree very much on the way postal reform should be handled, and I appreciate your letter and please feel free at any time to express your opinion.

Kindest personal regards,

Very truly yours,

NORBERT T. TIEMANN,  
Governor.

STATE OF IDAHO,  
Boise, October 1, 1969.

Mr. PATRICK J. NILAN,  
United Federation of Postal Clerks, AFL-CIO,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. NILAN: I appreciated your comprehensive letter of September 26 regarding postal reform, together with the enclosed brochure.

While I have not had time to go through the material thoroughly, I nevertheless will certainly keep it on file for future reference.

The postal corporation approach seems to be buried for this session of the National Congress.

I would agree with your statement that the goal of everyone is the best possible postal service for the people of this country, and hopefully, we can look forward toward attainment of that goal in the near future.

Sincerely,

DON SAMUELSON,  
Governor.

ALLEGHENY VALLEY  
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,  
Tarentum, Pa., October 14, 1969.

HON. HUGH SCOTT,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SCOTT: Concern about needed Postal Reform has initiated an in-depth study of the Kappel Commission Report and legislation sponsored for Total Postal Reform and Partial Postal Reform.

After this study and recommendation to the Board of Directors of the Allegheny Valley Chamber of Commerce, it was moved that the Chamber support H.R. 4, authorized by the Chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Representative Thaddeus Dulski.

Your support of this Postal Reform bill will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

DONALD J. STEFL,  
President.

#### RAIL PASSENGERS ASK PENN CENTRAL TO CLARIFY DOWNGRADING OF SERVICE

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, an important factor in the increasing focus of attention on railroad passenger service has been the efforts of the National Association of Railroad Passengers and its chairman, Anthony Haswell. When legislation is enacted to establish Federal standards for railroad passenger service, much of the credit will belong to the NARP.

Ever alert to reports of downgraded service, the NARP recently asked Penn Central officials to clarify persistent rumors that it plans to substantially downgrade its east-west intercity passenger service effective October 26. As of today,

the Penn Central had not responded to the NARP's request.

This is a matter which clearly should be subject to full and fair scrutiny. If Penn Central's intercity service is being downgraded, the public has a right to know that, and the reasons for it. If the rumors are unfounded, the railroad certainly should set the record straight.

I present herewith for inclusion in the RECORD the text of the NARP's news release on the reports:

#### RAIL PASSENGER GROUP ASKS PENN CENTRAL TO CLARIFY REPORTS OF SERVICE DOWNGRADING

WASHINGTON.—The National Association of Railroad Passengers said today it had asked Penn Central for clarification of "persistent rumors" that the railroad is planning a "substantial downgrading" of its east-west intercity passenger service coincident with publication of new timetables on October 26.

NARP Chairman Anthony Haswell requested the clarification in a telegram to Penn Central Chairman Stuart Saunders on Wednesday morning (October 15). A reply was requested by the close of business on Thursday, NARP said no reply had been received by the requested deadline.

Haswell said that according to the reports, the downgrading would include the elimination of dining and sleeping car service on some trains and schedule changes which could result in missed connections.

"Downgrading of service would seriously weaken chances for Congressional action on a reasonable program of Federal assistance and would thus not serve the best interests of the industry and traveling public," Haswell's message declared. Text of telegram follows:

"NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RAILROAD PASSENGERS,

Washington, D.C.

"Mr. STUART SAUNDERS,  
"Chairman of the Board, Penn Central Railroad, Philadelphia, Pa.:

"We have heard persistent rumors that Penn Central is planning a substantial downgrading of east-west intercity passenger service to coincide with the Oct. 26 timetable change. According to these reports, dining and sleeping car service would be removed from some trains and others would be rescheduled to less convenient times which could result in missed connections. It is our hope that these rumors have no basis in fact. Downgrading of service would seriously weaken chances for Congressional action on a reasonable program of Federal assistance and would thus not serve the best interests of the industry or traveling public. Would appreciate a reply as to the veracity of these reports by the close of business on Thursday, October 16.

"ANTHONY HASWELL,  
Chairman."

#### OPERATION ARBOR GREEN IN BROOME COUNTY, N.Y.

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, recently I received the October issue of Soil Conservation which has an article entitled "Operation Arbor Green Charms Suburbanites." According to the article, Sam Rizzi and the Broome County soil and water conservation district have found a novel way to be of greater service to suburbanites.

Far too often the suburban landowner is unable to use the services of essentially agricultural agencies. However, thanks to the imaginative thinking of Sam Rizzi, hundreds of suburbanites in the Binghamton area now have two, three, or even a dozen trees planted in their yards. I congratulate Sam Rizzi and the Broome County SCS for their initiative in extending a SCS program to suburban landowners. The details of "Operation Arbor Green" are in the article that follows:

**OPERATION ARBOR GREEN CHARMS  
SUBURBANITES**

A thousand trees ordered by suburbanites in an hour stirred up more excitement in Binghamton, Broome County, than did the planting of more than a million trees last spring by landowners in another rural county in New York.

Those thousand-an-hour trees bought from a commercial nursery and sold by the Broome County Soil and Water Conservation District weren't sold in one bundle, but singly, or in packages of three or seven trees—whatever number the buyer needed. The demand was so great that some 2,000 people called or queued up to buy 26,500 trees and plant them on at least a thousand small properties.

Sam Rizzi started it all. He's one of the new breed of conservation district directors, representing the nonfarm landowners and land-users in the Broome County District. He doesn't own a farm. He likes trees, though. "The State Conservation Department sells trees only in bundles of a thousand. My neighbors in the housing development need two, or maybe 20, trees for planting a steep bank, or a clump for wildlife cover, or just for beauty," said Rizzi.

So Sam persuaded the other directors that the Broome District should buy a thousand seedlings from a commercial nursery for resale. Sam agreed to handle the publicity for "Operation Arbor Green."

As soon as the story broke in the papers and was announced on the radio and TV, orders started coming in and didn't stop when the thousand trees were gone.

"What do we do now?" cried the two district clerks. The private nurseryman was contacted again. Yes, he'd be very happy to supply another 25,000 trees and so on.

The girls spent several days just answering telephone inquiries. People who couldn't get a call through stood in line outside the office door to order trees.

The girls figured they had more than 2,000 callers. Very few of these people had ever had any previous contact with the district, or any of the other agencies in the Broome County Farm and Home Center. They were glad to learn how the district directors working with commercial nurserymen could provide this much needed service.

Next year the district directors plan to increase the number of varieties of trees and add some wildlife shrubs. They hope this is just the beginning of many new ways the district can expand its program to reach more urban and suburban landowners and get more land treatment done.

**THE SHERWOOD FOREST OF AUTO  
REPAIRS SHOPS**

**HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN**

OF NEW YORK

Monday, October 20, 1969

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Washington Post spoke of auto mechanics as unrelenting "Black-

beards" in their appraisal of our automobile problems, and bemoaned the disadvantaged consumer's plight in the murky "Sherwood Forest" of auto repair shops. The metaphors, if somewhat bitterly humorous, are nevertheless indicative of a serious public mood today. Many car owners have a deeply felt mistrust and cynicism toward those men who repair their vehicles. To expose this emotion in its true depth, perhaps the editorial's sharp irony was necessary and I commend it for my colleagues' perusal.

Indeed, it is this very deterioration in the business relationship between the public and the tradesmen that I seek to reverse in my legislation to provide Federal support for State training and licensing of auto mechanics.

I would also like to commend Senator HART, who has recently drawn attention to the need for licensing auto mechanics in the opening statement of his subcommittee investigation into the auto repair industry. I trust he will devote a major portion of these hearings to this key contributing factor in the high cost of repairs.

Therefore, I would like to insert in the RECORD the October 10, 1969, editorial of the Washington Post, as follows:

**REGULATING THE MECHANICS**

It may well be that Sen. Philip A. Hart—and he himself comes from Michigan, mind you—has taken the most significant step toward rationalizing the automobile and mitigating its mastery of man since the invention of the internal combustion engine. The senator has proposed a national program for licensing auto repair facilities and for certification of mechanics who perform repair work. Hallelujah! "When a motorist takes his car in for repairs, he has no assurance whatsoever that the facility is adequate or the mechanic skilled," the senator said.

Now, there stands the understatement of the decade. No assurance whatsoever? Actually, what the sucker has assurance of is that he is going to have to mortgage his house in order to get his car back. Taken as a class, automobile repair men are undoubtedly the most winsome, charming, sympathetic, and ruthless characters ever to band together for the beneficent exploitation of innocence. A garageman telling a disconsolate car owner that he must summarily consign his almost brand new wide-track Typhoon V-9 to a junk heap unless he is prepared to equip it with an entirely new lower intestinal tract can be as tender as a mother, as understanding as a father-confessor—yet as firm and unrelenting as Blackbeard at a gangplank.

No one could be nicer—or more patently distressed—than the garage mechanic who, rising from a cursory inspection of your automobile engine, regrettably tells you that the amplifiers are intoxicated, the diatherms seriously calcified, and the whole varicose system in urgent need of a complete underhaul. All of this, he tells you, sadness softening his rather attractively smeared countenance, can be taken care of for hardly more than half of what it would cost to purchase one of the new models of your particular brand of white elephant.

Yes, they're delightful fellows, almost without exception. But should they be allowed to go on practicing their form of witchdoctory without any let or hindrance? Senator Hart thinks not. According to the lowest estimates, he says, one-third of all auto repairs are unsatisfactory. He means, we surmise, unsatisfactory to the auto owner, not unsatisfactory the repairman. "The consumer who visits the barber or beautician,

the podiatrist or plumber knows that to receive their licenses certain skills were necessary," the senator pointed out. "Yet anyone can hold himself out as an expert mechanic, although human lives literally may depend on how well he knows and performs his job."

Well, we don't mean to get moralistic about the situation or to quibble about a fatality or two resulting from faulty repair jobs. Errors and accidents can occur in any line of work. And we should not like on any account to sour the dispositions or cloud the compassion of the merry men who inhabit the Sherwood Forests called repair shops. We suggest no more—and neither, we are confident, does Senator Hart—than that charm be supplemented by some rudimentary understanding of what goes on underneath the hood of an automobile and that a twinge of scruple be injected into this form of freebootery. We are not asking for an even break, you understand; we'd just like the kind of reassurance one gets from a doctor's diploma hung on the waiting room wall.

**OCTOBER 19-25 MARKS 21ST ANNUAL  
OBSERVANCE OF CLEANER  
AIR WEEK**

**HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, this week, communities throughout the country are observing the 21st annual Cleaner Air Week, from October 19 through the 25th.

As my colleagues know, Mr. Charles N. Howison, a constituent of mine, was the originator of what has become a very widely observed and most worthwhile week in October.

Each year, Mr. Howison compiles a Cleaner Air Week handbook, for use by city, county, and State officials in coordinating efforts to observe Cleaner Air Week. The last page of this year's handbook features a most interesting editorial by Mr. Howison.

The editorial follows:

**A GENERATION OF PROGRESS**

(By Charles Howison)

If asked to label the past, present and future of air conservation as they appear in the perspective of Cleaner Air Week's 21-year involvement with air problems, we would call on three tenses of the intransitive verb, to be:

Much Has Been Done

MUCH IS BEING DONE

Much Remains To Be Done

All three divisions of the story are vital information, but we have enclosed the present tense in capitals to emphasize one of the greatest—and least known—chapters in the annals of cooperative human achievement that is presently unfolding in urban America.

Growth is the operating environment we know best in America. Each year, for example, our production technology rises to new heights in bringing more and more material advantages to an ever-increasing population. Thus, more and more of our people possess increasing means to pursue the ends of each individual's choice—whether those ends be spiritual, educational, political, purely pleasurable, selfish or magnanimous.

Those two concomitants of our free enterprise system—population growth and technological development—generally treat us like Dutch uncles, and we count among the



blessings they have bestowed upon us the greatest political freedom and the highest economic attainments ever known to man.

#### THE ACES AND PAINS OF GROWTH

The flow of benefits, as a matter of fact, has been a little bit faster than we can handle and we have been known to yell pretty loudly when caught in jammed highways, crowded airports, standing-room-only classrooms, snail-paced mail service—and in eddies of fly ash from an over-worked air conservation system.

Programs now under way in every community are closing the technological gap between our escalating production and the control of these unwanted by-products. The national Cleaner Air Week committee is particularly proud of the gains our engineers are scoring in restoring the quality of the air which they have so badly overworked in the jet age. There is irony, too, in the increasing volume of public indignation. Pollution's irritations to our sense of sight, smell, and taste, it seems, become harder and harder to bear, even as the fantastically intricate clean air prescriptions of our area control officials bring us closer and closer to our air quality goals.

America has a way of shortcutting in solving a problem. It calls up an emotionally aroused public and the nearer we come to a solution, the louder becomes the hue and cry for a solution—now! It's an expensive process, but it works. It is working so well for Cleaner Air Week, as a matter of fact, that our theater of operations has expanded from 42 metropolitan areas to 170 in the last ten years.

One of the casualties of spotlighting the unsolved air conservation problems has been our awareness that a great deal is being done to solve them. Pittsburgh, for example, approaches the five hundred million dollar mark in expenditures for control hardware alone and the steel city is the rule rather than the exception to the metropolitan area progress story. Inevitably, it seems, the sure, steady progress of community conservation programs becomes lost as public attention increasingly focuses on the more spectacular unsolved remainder.

#### THE PROGRESS STORY

There's a time, however, when the crisis approach has spent its usefulness and in our field of air conservation, that time is now. We only have to look at the March 19 announcement of the Air Pollution Control Association which revealed dramatic improvements in particular reduction in 21 metropolitan areas throughout the country. True, the APCA announcement didn't fully penetrate the blizzard of panic propaganda beclouding the air conservation atmosphere. It did, however, find daylight in many publications. In Perth Amboy the News-Tribune chose this good news as the subject of an editorial. The authoritative Air and Water Pollution Report was so delighted at its upbeat contents that they published every word of this pivotal APCA release. Most gratified by this announcement, however, were the area control officials whose achievements made up the body of the announcement. These men represent the backbone of APCA's membership—the hundreds of local conservation quarterbacks who are calling signals for community air quality teams.

Cleaner Air Week—Edition 21—salutes the unsung hero of air conservation—the metropolitan area control official. All too often he's too deeply involved in his community's battle for clean air to blow his own horn. And this year, Cleaner Air Week presents area committees with the ideal opportunity to help remedy this omission of communication. Every Cleaner Air Week Committee will have scores of occasions to relate different aspects of the year's control progress under the leadership of the man down at City Hall who spends ten hours a day coaxing wheel-

ding, threatening, engineering, policing, and panning a better atmosphere for his growing, crowding, jamming, seam bursting, and thriving community.

#### FEDERAL TRIBUTE

The Air Quality Act of 1967 pays the sincerest tribute of all to the metropolitan area control director by setting up the administration of air pollution control by regions. We applaud this acknowledgement that air conservation is a local responsibility and predict that regional air quality gains will be greatest where full use is made of the expertise and authority of the man who shoulders the day-to-day responsibility for safeguarding community air quality.

A generation of Cleaner Air Weeks have joined the interests of industry, government, education and the individual resident in a community-wide approach to air conservation. We've driven pretty hard at times and spared no person or group in pursuing "what needs to be done" in restoring air quality.

From here on out, let's couple what needs to be done with "what is being done."

### AUTOMOTIVE PRIVILEGES FOR THE DISABLED

#### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Harry A. Schweikert, Jr., administrative assistant, Paralyzed Veterans of America, Inc., has compiled a most interesting and helpful digest of the various State laws regarding automobile privileges for the disabled. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of this article:

#### METHODS OF TRAVEL

There are five general modes of transportation. These are auto, bus, taxi, plane, and rail. The person confined to a wheelchair cannot use the bus unless he and his wheelchair are physically carried aboard individually. Today's rail and subway systems are not only inaccessible, but their design presents many hazards to the w/c/b traveler. Air travel is the best and safest means of travel for long distances, yet the carriers are not only reluctant to carry these disabled, but many times actually prohibit it. The taxi is a reasonable method of transportation, second only to the private automobile, but it is expensive, and it is not always available. In addition, many cabbies will not stop for the w/c/b person.

That leaves the automobile, which is the best means of travel for the severely disabled person. It is safe and comfortable. It is always there. And, when one can afford it, it is always reliable. Persons with good upper extremities can drive a hand-controlled car with ease and safety. Thanks to the many power assists in today's car, even those with limited use of their upper extremities can be good drivers.

Country driving is good for the soul, they say. But it also poses no problems. To the urban commuter, there are some forbidding obstacles. It is not the moving traffic which threatens. And it is not the wild pedestrian. It is the elusive and sometimes non-existent parking place. Of course, this is a problem for all commuters. But the non-disabled commuter can park a block away or across the street with little hazard to himself. The w/c/b person must find a spot close to his place of employment, or wherever he may go, not only for convenience, but for safety. If he parks far away he must cross busy

thoroughfares. And he will require help up and down curbs. If he parks on the wrong side of the street, or if there is an obstacle on the curb-side, he will have to get into his wheelchair right in the busy traffic lane.

The answer to the driving and parking problem for the disabled is good, cognizant legislation. Today thirty-nine of our states provide some type of privilege for the disabled person who drives a car, owns a car, or must use one for his transportation. These range from the excellent, all-inclusive, to the minimum. However, there are eleven states which, at this writing, have done nothing. These are Alaska, Iowa, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Ohio, Texas, Virginia, and Wyoming. To these we can add the most impossible of all, our Nation's Capital, the District of Columbia.

#### SURVEY OF STATES

The following represents the results of a survey conducted by the Paralyzed Veterans of America on the automotive privileges which each state extends to the disabled motorist. It is an updated and expanded version of a previous survey published in 1963. In the original, our attention was focused on the civilian disabled. Here, we include laws granting privileges to civilian and war veterans.

Our survey concentrated on eleven specific questions presented to the motor vehicle agency of each state in the following manner:

1. Does your State issue special license plates and/or other identification tags for the automobiles of disabled individuals?
2. Are any special provisions made for disabled veterans?
3. Does your State grant special parking privileges for the disabled motorist?
4. What type and extent of disability must exist before such privileges are granted?
5. What proof of disability do you require?
6. Must the individual to whom these privileges are extended be the actual owner of the vehicle?
7. Must the individual to whom these privileges are extended be the actual driver of the vehicle?
8. How many disabled drivers are using these privileges?
9. How many veterans are using these privileges?
10. Has your State completed any survey on the driving habits of the disabled in your State?

As is usual with government agencies, the response was varied. Some responded immediately with all information requested plus copies of all relative laws. Others responded less enthusiastically, and several did not respond at all. Where information was not completely provided, follow-up letters were sent, in some instances using the offices of U.S. Senators to prod their cooperation. Where there was interpretive question the services of the Library of Congress were used. And verbatim copies of all state laws were received and recorded.

In presenting these findings to you, we will first list the privileges extended state by state. Then we shall append some special remarks relative to the subject. Lastly, you will find a chart outlining in simple form the privileges, noted, with footnotes.

#### STATE PRIVILEGES

**Alabama.**—Any handicapped or paraplegic driver may, upon payment of a one-dollar fee, be issued a distinctive flag of distress. This flag may be displayed when the driver is getting into or out of the car, or when in motor vehicle distress. (Code of Alabama, Laws of 1961, Chapter 20, title 51, Section 700 to 720.)

Any veteran who is suffering a physical disability which requires that any motor vehicle he operates be equipped with special mechanical controls, is eligible upon payment of one dollar for issue of a special dis-

abled veterans plate. This fee shall be in addition to any other fees and taxes charged. (Title 36, Section 75(17)).

A veteran of any war or other hostility, who has received a grant from the Veterans Administration toward the purchase of a car is exempt from payment of all license fees and ad valorem taxes so long as the vehicle is used only for private use. He is not exempt from the payment of the one-dollar fee for special disabled veteran plates. (Title 51, Section 717(1)).

**Arizona.**—Any person who has sustained a permanent disability rendering it difficult and burdensome to walk, may be issued a special identification insignia by the State Motor Vehicle Division. This does not convey any special parking privileges on the state level. (Arizona Revised Statutes, Section 28-873.01) (Ostensibly, the provision of special privilege is left to the local governments.)

**Arkansas.**—Any veteran who has received a grant from the Veterans Administration toward the purchase of a car shall be exempt from payment of registration fee. (1957 Replacement, Section 75-261).

Each veteran who is issued free registration is also eligible for a special emblem for attachment to his license plate. (Section 75-262.) This emblem shall identify the owner and operator as a disabled veteran and shall exempt him from requiring any license or payment of any fee for the privilege of operating his vehicle upon the streets or alleys of any city, town, or incorporated village.

(Respondent indicates that some cities in the State do grant special parking privileges to the physically handicapped under local ordinances.)

**California.**—Any person who has lost, or lost the use of, one or both legs, or is so severely disabled as to be unable to move without the aid of a mechanical device, may be issued a distinguishing disabled person license plate. There shall be no fee over and above the regulation registration fee. (California Vehicle Code, Section 22511.5.)

Any veteran who as a result of his military service has lost, or lost the use of both legs, or who is blind, may be issued a distinguishing disabled veterans plate without payment of registration or other fee. (Section 9105).

The disabled person to whom these special plates are issued, shall be allowed to park for unlimited periods in parking zones restricted as to the length of parking time permitted. It shall not apply to zones where stopping, standing, or parking is prohibited to all vehicles, or which are reserved for special types of vehicles.

**Colorado.**—Any veteran who, as a result of his military service suffered the loss or permanent loss of use of one or both feet, or one or both hands, or who has permanent impairment of vision in both eyes, shall be eligible for special disabled veteran license plates without payment of registration fee. (Colorado Revised Statutes, Section 13-3-23(f)).

**Connecticut.**—Any person holding an operator's license, whose ability to walk is seriously impaired, may be issued a special identification card. This will permit overtime parking without penalty in legal parking areas restricted as to time for the holder of the permit. (General Statutes, Chapter 246, Section 14253)

A veteran of any war who has lost, or lost the use of, one or both arms or legs, or who is blind, paraplegic, or hemiplegic as a result of his military service, may be issued a special identification plate without payment of registration or other fee. (Section 14-49(o)) A special identification card shall also be issued which will permit the owner to park overtime in any legal area without penalty, except that such time will not exceed 24 hours. (Section 14-254)

**Delaware.**—Any person who has lost, or lost the use of a leg or both legs, or arm or both

arms, or any combination thereof, may be issued a special registration plate at no fee above the normal registration fee. (Delaware Code Annotated, Section 2134)

The handicapped person to whom the special plate is issued, or the person operating the vehicle for him, will be permitted to park 90 minutes longer than the legal parking period allowed without penalty. This does not apply where there is an ordinance prohibiting parking during heavy traffic periods during morning, afternoon, or evening rush hours, or where it would clearly present a traffic hazard. (Chapter 21, Section 4180A)

Delaware has a code restricting the amount of surcharge for assigned risk insurance. If a person tries two insurance companies and is refused both times for some reason, the Insurance Commission can direct a carrier to accept him (Chapter 29, Section 2907).

**Florida.**—Any person who has suffered the loss or loss of use of one or both legs, and who is licensed to operate a motor vehicle in the State of Florida, may be issued a special identification certificate and sticker for display on his vehicle. No county, city, town, or any agency thereof, shall exact any fee for parking on the public streets or highways. No penalty shall be imposed for parking in such metered space for longer periods of time than are permitted by ordinance. (Florida Statutes, Section 317.01011)

Any veteran who has received a grant from the Veterans Administration toward the purchase of a car may be issued special disabled veteran plates without payment of registration or other fee. (Section 320.084)

Any veteran who has been discharged from the Armed Forces with a 100% service connected disability, and who is qualified to obtain an operator's or chauffeur's license, is exempt from all driver license fees. (Section 322.21)

**Georgia.**—Special and distinctive license plates may be issued to any veteran who has suffered the loss or loss of use of one or both feet, or one or both hands, or who has permanent impairment of vision in both eyes. Those veterans who suffered their injuries in service as a result of war or other armed conflict shall be exempt from payment of registration fee. Veterans of WWI who receive statutory awards from the VA for similar disabilities, shall likewise be exempt from payment of registration fee. Disabled veterans not entitled to free plates will be eligible for the distinctive plates at regular registration fee. (Georgia Code Annotated, Section 68-254; 254.1, and 254.2)

It has been reported that the following cities in the State of Georgia grant certain parking privileges to disabled veterans: Athens, Augusta, Dublin, Fort Valley, Griffin, Jackson, Macon, Monticello, Monroe, Perry, Savannah, Savannah Beach, Sparta, Sylvester, and Valdosta.

**Hawaii.**—Any veteran who has received a grant from the Veterans Administration toward the purchase of a car is exempt from payment of license fee and county vehicular taxes. (Hawaii Revised Statutes, Section 249-6, previously known as Hawaii Rev. Law Sec. 130-6)

**Idaho.**—Any veteran who is in receipt of compensation from the Veterans Administration or from any of the Armed Forces in lieu thereof, for 100% total service-connected disability, or the loss or loss of use of one or both feet or one or both hands, or permanent impairment of vision in both eyes constituting virtual blindness, shall be eligible for special disabled veteran plates without fee or registration cost. (Idaho Code, Section 49-109, as amended by House Bill No. 99, eff. June 7, 1967.)

**Illinois.**—Any veteran who has received a grant from the Veterans Administration toward the purchase of a car, or who is in receipt of compensation for a total and permanent service-connected disability, is eligible for the issue of special registration

plates at no cost to the veteran. (Illinois Revised Statutes, Chapter 95½, Section 3-608)

**Indiana.**—Any veteran who has suffered the loss, or permanent loss of use, of one or both feet, or one or both hands, as a result of his service in the Armed Forces, shall be eligible for the issue of special disabled veteran plates without payment of fee. (Burns Indiana Statutes, Chapter 12, Section 47-2627 to 47-2629)

Any vehicle displaying the special disabled veteran plates shall be permitted to park on the streets of any town or city within the State without regard to any local ordinance which fixes a time limit for the parking of motor vehicles.

**Kansas.**—Any veteran who is entitled to compensation from the Veterans Administration for a service incurred disability involving the loss, or permanent loss of use of one or both feet, or one or both hands, or for permanent visual impairment of both eyes to a prescribed degree, is eligible for the issue of special disabled veteran plates without charge. (Kansas Statutes annotated, Section 8-160)

Motor vehicles bearing the distinctive disabled veteran plates shall be permitted to park without charge in any metered zone of any city of the first, second, or third class. (Section 8-161)

Any disabled citizen's organization, duly authorized to operate as a nonprofit organization within the State, and has actually established and is operating motor vehicle drivers training courses for disabled citizens, shall be eligible for issue of up to two sets of registration plates entitled to have two passenger vehicles and two trucks registered, and be issued special distinctive license plates without charge to such organization. (Section 8-161 a & b)

Respondent indicates that some cities in the State of Kansas issue identifying insignia to severely disabled residents granting them special parking privileges.

**Kentucky.**—Any person who has lost the use of a leg or both legs, or an arm or both arms, or who is blind, is eligible for the issue of a special decal which shall identify the vehicle as belonging to a handicapped person. There shall be no charge or other fee than the regular fee for registration of the car. (Kentucky Revised Statutes, Section 189-445, Paragraph 1.)

Any motor vehicle exhibiting this special insignia may, when it is being operated by or for the benefit of the handicapped person, be parked for a period of two hours in excess of the legal parking period permitted by local ordinance. It does not apply to areas where parking is specifically prohibited, where it may be hazardous, or where police regulations are posted to provide for the accommodation of heavy traffic during rush hours. (Paragraph 2.)

**Louisiana.**—Any amputee or blind veteran of World War II, or of service on or after June 27, 1950, who has received a grant from the Veterans Administration toward the purchase of a car, is exempt from payment of any registration or license fee for a special non-transferrable license plate. (Revised Statutes of 1950, Section 47-463B)

The City of New Orleans issues placards to persons delivering or picking up double amputees which permits the driver a maximum of fifteen minutes parking time in any restricted zone. There is no indication that any parking privilege is extended to the disabled driver himself.

**Maine.**—Any person who is permanently confined to a wheelchair, or restricted to the permanent use of crutches or braces, or otherwise handicapped in such a way that his mobility is seriously restricted, shall upon payment of a one-dollar fee, be eligible to receive a special designating tag or placard identifying the vehicle as belonging to a disabled person. (Revised Statutes, Chapter 25, Section 252)



Any amputee or blind veteran who has received a grant from the Veterans Administration toward the purchase of a car, is exempt from payment of any registration fee. (Revised Statutes, title 29, Section 251) Such veteran shall also be eligible for an operator's license without fee (Section 536) and exemption from excise taxes (title 36, Section 1483 (12) and sales taxes (Section 1760 (22)) on such vehicles.

Any amputee or blind veteran receiving compensation from the Veterans Administration for a service-connected disability and who shall have a specially designed motor vehicle, is exempt from payment of any registration fee. (Chapter 25, Section 251)

Any veteran who is exempt from registration fee under Section 251 of this act, is eligible for issue of special disabled veteran plates.

**Maryland.**—Any veteran who has lost or lost the use of one or both legs, or an arm or a hand, or who is blind, shall be eligible for distinctive registration plates and identification marker provided he is a certified member of the American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, or Veterans of Foreign Wars. (Annotated Code of Maryland, Article 66½, Section 32) Any veteran who has received a grant from the Veterans' Administration toward the purchase of a car shall be exempt from payment of fees for registration and Certificate of title. (Article 66½, Section 23.)

The City of Baltimore, in extended hardship cases, will set aside a special parking place for specific disabled individuals. However, each case will be processed individually and on its merit.

**Massachusetts.**—Any person who is blind, or who has suffered the loss or permanent loss of use of one or both feet or hands, is eligible upon payment of regular fee for issue of special distinctive license plates for his car. (Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 90, Section 2)

A veteran of any war who by reason of his service in the Armed Forces suffered loss or loss of use of one or both feet or hands, or who is blind, is eligible for issue of distinctive numbered license plates. (Chapter 90, Section 2) No fee shall be exacted for either registration or license of any veteran who is issued special plates. (Chapter 90, Section 33)

No excise tax shall be imposed on vehicles of the disabled or blind. (Chapter 60A, Section 1)

No fee shall be exacted and no penalty shall be imposed for parking in a meter or other time-limited zone of any vehicle bearing the distinctive license plates issued to the disabled and blind. (Chapter 40, Section 22A)

In addition to the State authorized parking privileges, the City of Boston permits handicapped drivers to park in downtown parking zones where such parking is prohibited between the hours of 8:00 and 9:30 A.M., thereby giving the handicapped worker an unlimited choice of parking space.

**Michigan.**—Any veteran who has been honorably discharged from the Armed Services and who has lost or lost the use of one or both feet, or one or both hands, or suffers permanent impairment of vision of both eyes, and any physically handicapped person who possesses material incapacity for ambulation, shall be entitled to receive a serially numbered certificate of identification for the personal use of the veteran or physically handicapped person. (Michigan Vehicle Code, Chapter 75b, Section 9.2375)

The veteran or physically handicapped person shall be entitled to courtesy in the parking of his vehicle which shall relieve him from any violations with respect to parking. Such privilege does not extend to local ordinances which may restrict certain areas for the purpose of creating fire lanes, or to provide for the accommodation of heavy traffic during rush hours.

**Minnesota.**—Any person who has sustained an amputation or permanent material disability of either or both arms or legs, or who has been otherwise permanently disabled in any manner rendering it difficult and burdensome to walk, shall be eligible for issue of two special identifying emblems, without charge, for display upon each plate of his car. (Minnesota Statutes Annotated, Section 169.345)

Any veteran who has received a grant from the Veterans Administration toward the purchase of a car, shall be exempt from payment of motor vehicle registration tax. (Section 168.031)

Any physically handicapped person who displays the distinguishing insignia upon his car shall be entitled to courtesy in the parking of his car. Such courtesy shall not be extended to any zone or area where local ordinance prohibits parking for the purpose of creating a fire lane or for the accommodation of heavy traffic during the morning or afternoon rush hours, nor shall it apply to any street or highway where parking has been strictly prohibited. (Section 169.345)

Any physically handicapped driver shall upon the payment of a \$1.00 fee, be eligible for issue of a distress flag which can be displayed by him when getting into or out of his vehicle, or when in motor vehicle distress. (Section 169.755)

Any person operating a motor vehicle in the state of Minnesota shall bring such vehicle to a stop and give the right-of-way at any intersection of any street, avenue or alley, or other public highway, to a blind person carrying a white painted cane when such blind person enters said intersection by holding out his white cane with the arm extended. (Section 169.202)

**Missouri.**—There are not indicated privileges on the State level for the disabled motorist. However, our informant states that at least two cities, Joplin and Springfield, issue special windshield identification stickers which permit the disabled motorist to park in metered zones without charge. There are signs posted at some metered zones which say "Reserved for Physically Handicapped."

**Nevada.**—Any person who has a permanent physical handicap which impairs his mobility when not in a motor vehicle, shall be entitled to issue of a special parking permit upon payment of one dollar. (Nevada Revised Statutes, Section 482.384)

**New Hampshire.**—Any person who is unable to walk without the assistance of crutches, canes, braces, artificial limbs or other similar walking aids, or who is confined to a wheelchair, shall be eligible for a special vehicle identification card at no cost. (Revised Statutes Annotated Chapter 260 Section 18a) He shall also be eligible for issue of a distress signal for use in any motor vehicle emergency. (Chapter 260 Section 18b)

Any amputee or blind veteran who has received a grant from the Veterans Administration toward the purchase of a car shall be exempt from the payment of registration fee, and shall be eligible for issue of special vehicle identification tag at no cost to the veteran. (Chapter 260 Sections 17, 18, 28 and 29)

Any motor vehicle displaying the special vehicle identification tag or card shall be allowed free parking in any city or town for a continuous period of not more than 24 hours at one time. (Chapter 249 Section 4a)

**New Jersey.**—Any person who has sustained an amputation or either or both legs or arms, or of parts of either or both legs or arms, or who has been otherwise disabled in any manner rendering it difficult or burdensome to walk, shall be eligible at no cost for special identification card and other insignia. No penalty will be imposed on any car exhibiting such identification under any law or municipal ordinance for periods of parking

not to exceed 24 hours in any one location. (Revised Statutes, Sections 39:4-204 through 39:4-207)

A disabled veteran who has received a grant from the Veterans Administration toward the purchase of a car shall be exempt from payment of registration fee. (Section 39:3-27.1)

**New Mexico.**—Any veteran who served in the Armed Forces between September 16, 1940, or after June 1, 1950, and who suffered the loss or complete and total loss of use of one or both legs at or above the ankle, or one or both arms at or above the wrist, while so serving, or from a service-connected cause, shall be exempt from payment of any motor vehicle registration fee on one passenger vehicle owned by him. (New Mexico Statutes Section 64-11-7)

**New York.**—Any disabled veteran who has received a grant from the Veterans Administration toward the purchase of a car will be exempt from payment of registration fee. (New York State Vehicle and Traffic Law, Section 401-6-C)

The State of New York does not issue any special plates or identification tags to disabled persons, and there are no provisions of the law which afford disabled persons special parking privileges. The Commissioner of Motor Vehicles is empowered, and does, issue distinctive disabled veteran plates to individuals and to members of various veterans' organizations.

The New York State Thruway Authority authorizes the issue of special identification plates and stickers for veterans who are eligible for free disabled veteran plates. This identification permits the veteran to use the State Thruway System without payment of fee.

There are several cities and towns which authorize special parking privileges for the disabled. The most significant of these is the City of New York, which issues a Special Vehicle Identification Permit to persons suffering permanent disability seriously impairing mobility, requiring the use of private automobile for transportation. Display of this certificate permits parking in metered zones without fee. However, it prohibits vehicles from parking double, in bus stops, hack stands, at fire hydrants, in fire zones, on crosswalks, or in zones designated for exclusive use of an agency or department. There can be no parking where "No Standing" or "No Stopping" regulations are in effect, or where a traffic hazard would be created. It must be noted that in order to be eligible for this certificate, the disabled person must be employed or a student a major part of the week in New York City.

The City of New York also exempts from sales tax the original car purchased from proceeds of the federal auto grant as issued by the Veterans Administration. (New York City Law 27, of 1946, Section L, Subsection N-41-2.0)

In the State of New York, every powered vehicle must have been registered and licensed. However, a motorized wheelchair is excused providing it is used by the disabled person alone, and carries no cargo or passenger.

**North Carolina.**—Any person who has an impairment that for all practicable purposes confines such person to a wheelchair, or that causes such person to walk with difficulty or insecurity and includes but is not limited to those persons using braces or crutches, may be issued upon the payment of \$2.00, a special distinctive flag and an identification card. (General Statutes 20-37.2) Such flag is to be exhibited visibly by the handicapped person when getting into or out of his car, or when in motor distress.

Any veteran who has received a grant from the Veterans Administration toward the purchase of a car shall be charged a registration fee of only \$1.00 and shall be exempt from personal property tax. (General Statutes 20-87(5); 105-297(13), and 165-44)

Special operator's license and permanent registration plates may be issued to afflicted or disabled persons for motorized vehicles weighing not more than 1000 pounds. (General Statutes 20-37.1)

**North Dakota.**—Any person who has sustained an amputation or material disability of either or both legs, or who has been otherwise disabled in any manner rendering it difficult or burdensome to walk, shall be eligible to receive without cost a distinguishing certificate or insignia which shall identify the vehicle as belonging to a physically handicapped person. (North Dakota Century Code, Section 39-01-15)

Any veteran who has received a grant from the Veterans Administration toward the purchase of a car, shall be exempt from payment of registration fee and from State sales or use tax. On payment of \$1.00, said veteran shall receive special license plates and emblems. (Sections 39-04-18 and 39-04-19)

Any physically handicapped person who displays the special certificate or other identification upon an automobile parked by him or under his direction and for his use, shall be entitled to courtesy in the parking of his vehicle. Provided, however, that any municipality may by ordinance, prohibit parking on any street or highway for the purpose of creating a fire lane, or to provide for the accommodation of heavy traffic during morning and afternoon rush hours, under which circumstances, such courtesy shall not apply.

The City of Bismarck will issue to any person who has lost or has lost the use of one or both legs, or is so severely disabled as to be unable to move without the aid of crutches, braces, canes, wheelchair, or other mechanical device, a special identification permit for his car. This permit, when displayed prominently on his car, shall permit that disabled person to park his car in any time limiting parking zone for unlimited periods. The parking privileges shall not apply to any parking zone in which stopping, parking, or standing of motor vehicles is prohibited, or which is reserved for special use. (Revised Ordinances of the City of Bismarck, Article 17, Chapter X, Section 10.1702)

**Oklahoma.**—Any disabled veteran who has received a grant from the Veterans Administration toward the purchase of a car is exempt from payment of registration fee. Statutes Annotated, title 47, Section 38.1

Eligible veterans may secure special vehicle identification plates for an automobile, pickup truck, or farm truck, not to exceed two tons carrying capacity, which is not for hire. A fee of \$2.15 shall be charged for such special plates.

While there is no state law granting special parking privileges to the disabled motorist, respondent indicates that certain municipalities do have such privileges.

**Oregon.**—Any person who is so severely physically and permanently disabled as to be unable to move from place to place without the aid of a wheelchair is eligible to receive without charge a special decal and identifying plates which shall be conspicuously displayed. (Oregon Revised Statutes, Sections 483.352 and 483.356.)

Any vehicle marked with this distinctive insignia may park overtime without penalty in zones where parking is permitted one hour or more. Such parking shall be allowed without regard to parking restrictions imposed by any city or county ordinances. This privilege shall not apply to zones where stopping, parking, or standing of all motor vehicles is prohibited, to zones where parking is restricted to under one hour, or to zones reserved for special types of motor vehicles or activities. (Section 483.354.)

**Pennsylvania.**—Any person who has lost the use of one or both legs, or one or both arms, or who is blind, is eligible for special license plates identifying the vehicle as be-

longing to a handicapped person. (Act No. 353, approved November 10, 1965, creating Section No. 501.1 in the Vehicle Code and amending No. 1021.)

Any amputee, blind, or paralyzed veteran, who suffered his disability in the Armed Forces during a period of war or armed conflict, is exempt from the payment of fees for certificate of title and registration. (Pennsylvania Statutes 75 Section 729.)

Any vehicle displaying a handicapped person's plate, when operated by or for the benefit of such handicapped person, shall be relieved of any liability with respect to parking for a period of ninety minutes in excess of the legal parking period permitted by local authorities except where local ordinances or police regulations prohibit parking on the highway for the purpose of creating a fire lane or where said ordinances or police regulations provide for the accommodation of heavy traffic during morning, afternoon or evening hours or where such motor vehicle is parked in such a manner as to clearly be a traffic hazard.

**Rhode Island.**—Any person who has lost or lost the use of one or both arms or legs by reason of amputation, or by consequence of paralysis or other permanent injury, and who is licensed to operate a specially designed pleasure motor vehicle, shall be eligible for issue of special metal tags without cost which shall identify the vehicle as belonging to such disabled person. (General Laws of Rhode Island, Section 31-28-7.)

Any veteran who served honorably in the Armed Forces during wartime or other campaign, and who has lost or lost the use of one or both his arms, hands, feet, or legs, or who has received a grant from the Veterans Administration toward the purchase of a car, shall be forever exempt from payment of all registration and license fees. (Section 31-6-8)

Any veteran who served honorably in the Armed Forces during wartime or other campaign, and who by reason of such service has become totally blind, shall be exempt from payment of any registration fee. (Section 31-6-9)

Any person who displays upon his vehicle the special identification tags authorized under Section 31-28-7, and any veteran displaying special registration plates authorized under sections 31-6-8 and 31-6-9, shall be exempt from any fee for parking on the public highways or in the metered parking spaces and zones of any city or town, and no penalty shall be imposed for overtime parking in such areas. These privileges shall not extend to places where parking is otherwise restricted or prohibited. (Sections 31-28-4; 31-28-5, and 31-28-6)

Any person suffering from paraplegia shall be exempt from payment of sales and use taxes on the purchase of a motor vehicle. (Section 44-18-30)

Any nonprofit charitable organization shall be forever exempt from the payment of any fee for the annual registration of a certain type of motor vehicle commonly known and described as a motorized wheelchair, and any person designated in writing by such nonprofit charitable organization, who shall operate the same, shall be exempt from any license requirements and fee for the operation thereof. (Section 31-6-7)

**South Carolina.**—Any person disabled by an impairment in the use of one or more limbs and required to use a wheelchair, but otherwise qualified for a driver's license, is eligible for a special plate identifying the vehicle as belonging to such disabled person. (Code of Laws, Article 7.3, Section 46-95.41)

Any veteran of wartime service who is entitled to compensation for the loss or loss of use of one or both legs, or one or both arms, or suffers from permanent impairment of vision in both eyes, is eligible for the issue of special disabled veterans plates for his personal motor vehicle or truck not to ex-

ceed three-quarter ton and is exempt from such registration and license fees as may be applicable. (1952 Code, Article 4, Section 46-61)

Personal vehicles owned by disabled veterans, for which special tag was issued, are exempt from state, county, and municipal taxes. (Article 65, Section 1522 (13))

**South Dakota.**—Any person who is disabled by paraplegia so as not to be able to get about without great difficulty, shall be eligible for issue of special license plates which will identify his car as belonging to an individual so disabled. (South Dakota Code, Section 44.0352)

Any veteran who is eligible to receive a grant from the Veterans Administration toward the purchase of a car, or any veteran who is in receipt of a statutory award for total disability which is service-connected in origin, shall be entitled to receive a special certificate of identification for his car. (Section 41.0512)

Any disabled person who displays upon his car the special registration plates or identification card shall be entitled to courtesy in the parking of such automobile which shall relieve him from liability for any violations with respect to parking. State law prohibits parking on the traveled portion of the highway in any spot unless a 15-foot lane is left unobstructed and there is a clear view for two hundred feet in either direction. Local authority may also prohibit parking on any street or highway for the purpose of creating a fire lane or accommodating heavy traffic during the morning and afternoon rush hours. (Sections 41.0513 and 44.0324)

Any vehicle owned and operated by a person authorized the special paraplegic license plates, may be equipped with not more than two flashing lights emitting an amber light without glare. One such lamp may be mounted on the front and one on the back of the car, not more than three inches from each plate. These may be used only when the car is stopped and the owner-operator is in need of assistance. (Section 44.0352)

**Tennessee.**—A veteran of any war or other hostility who, as a result of his service in the Armed Forces, suffered loss or permanent loss of use of one or both feet or hands, or who is blind, shall be exempt from payment of registration fee for either one automobile or one pick-up truck, if the pick-up is the veteran's only mode of transportation and is not used for hire. (Tennessee Code, Section 59-439)

**Utah.**—Any person who has lost or has lost the use of both legs or is so severely disabled as to be unable to ambulate without the aid of a wheelchair or other mechanical device, qualifies for issue of distinctive license plate or decal. (Enacted by Chapter 104, Laws of Utah 1967, Section 41-1-49.8)

Any person whose vehicle displays the significant license plate or decal shall be permitted to park his passenger vehicle for reasonable periods without charge in metered parking zones without regard to any other state or municipal ordinance or parking restriction. (Section 41-1-49.9)

**Vermont.**—Any veteran who has received a grant from the Veterans Administration toward the purchase of a car is exempt from payment of registration and driver's license fees. (Vermont Statutes Annotated, Section 23:378, 609)

Respondent states there are no state laws granting parking privileges for the disabled motorist, but some municipalities do.

**Washington.**—Any person who has lost, or lost the use of, both lower extremities, or who is so severely disabled as to be unable to move without the aid of crutches or a wheelchair, shall be eligible for issue of special distinguishing plates for his car, identifying that car as belonging to such disabled person. (Revised Code of Washington, Section 46.16)

Any veteran who is eligible to receive a



grant from the Veterans Administration toward the purchase of a car, is exempt from payment of registration fee. (Section 73.044.110)

Any person who displays upon his car the special distinguishing plate authorized the disabled shall be allowed to park his vehicle for unlimited periods of time in parking zones or areas which are otherwise restricted as to length of time parking is permitted. These privileges shall not apply to those zones or areas in which the stopping, parking, or standing of all vehicles is prohibited or which are reserved for special types of vehicles. (Section 46.48).

**West Virginia.**—Any veteran who has received a grant from the Veterans Administration toward the purchase of a car is exempt from payment of registration fee. Such exemption does not extend to payment of privilege tax or one dollar title fee. (West Virginia Code, Chapter 17-A, Article 10, Section 8)

**Wisconsin.**—Any person who is disabled by paraplegia, or the loss or loss of use of a leg, a foot, or both hands, or has minimum faulty vision of 20/200, or other condition certified to be of equal degree in disability so as not to be able to get about with great difficulty, shall be eligible for issue of special distinctive plates which identify the vehicle as belonging to such disabled person. (Wisconsin statutes, Section 341.14(1a).)

Any veteran who, as a result of his military service, is disabled by paraplegia, or the loss or loss of use of a leg, a foot, or both hands, or has minimum faulty vision of 20/200 or other condition certified to be of equal degree in disability so as not to be able to get about without great difficulty, shall be eligible for issue of special disabled veterans plates at no charge other than regular registration fee (Section 341.14(1)).

An automobile bearing the special handicapped or disabled veteran plates as provided under these laws is exempt from any ordinance imposing time limitations on parking in any street or highway zone and parking lot, municipally owned, or a municipal parking utility. Where the time limitation on a metered stall is one-half hour or more, no meter payment is required. It is otherwise subject to all other laws related to parking. (Sections 346.50(2) and 346.50(2a)).

**Wyoming.**—Any war veteran who has not

had full exemption from assessment as provided therein shall be exempt from payment of the county registration fee not in excess of such balance of exemption not taken. (Wyoming Statute, Section 31-16e)

#### DEFINITIONS

**Blindness.**—According to the Social Security Law, blindness is considered to exist when there is central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye with the use of correcting lens. An eye which is accompanied by a limitation in the fields of vision such that the widest diameter of the visual field subtends an angle no greater than 20 degrees shall be considered . . . as having a central visual acuity of 20/200 or less. (Social Security Act, Section 216 (1)(1).) A veteran is considered to be blind with 5/200 visual acuity or less. (Title 38, U.S. Code, Section 314(1)).

**License.**—Means any license issued under the laws of any state pertaining to the licensing of persons to operate a motor vehicle.

**Registration.**—Means the registration certificate or certificates and registration plates issued under the laws of any state which register and identify the vehicle. (Sometimes called license tags; registration plates, etc.)

**Driver Restriction.**—". . . persons whose mental or physical disability makes them incapable of exercising control over motor vehicles . . ."

#### SPECIAL REMARKS

The information above should not be taken literally. It is meant to acquaint the residents of each state with a brief description of the automotive privileges that state affords. For further specific information, the reader should write to his state's department of motor vehicles.

In some instances it was indicated on the survey that it was necessary for the disabled individual to be both owner and driver. Yet inspection of the statutes by the author proved otherwise. In most cases, those states which exempt from payment of registration and other fees all veterans who received a VA grant for the purchase of a car, also extend the same benefits to the veteran who is eligible for the grant but has not taken advantage of it. Likewise, most states continue these privileges for any car replacing the original vehicle.

Several states issue special identification

plates or other insignia for the automobile, but then do not enact any law granting special parking privileges. It will be found that many law enforcement personnel will recognize these insignia and refrain from issuing parking tickets. This is a matter of personal cognizance, however, and all laws pertaining to parking are otherwise enforceable.

Many cities and communities within a state may have special parking privileges for the disabled. If there is a state law granting such privileges, the state law supersedes that of any municipality. On the other hand, there are states which enact laws granting special parking privileges, but make them subject to local ordinances.

All existing parking privileges refer strictly to the vehicle which has special identification when it is being operated by or on behalf of the disabled person himself. But most states have severe penalties for non disabled persons who take advantage of the privilege, and the disabled person would be wise to see that this does not occur under penalty of losing that very essential privilege.

#### REFERENCE CHART

The chart below is included for simple reference. In reading it, please be guided by the remarks and footnotes which follow. The first three columns (A,B,C) refer generally to persons without military experience, but may include veterans when there is no special legislation for that group. The next two columns (D,E) refer to specific legislation for veterans of the Armed Forces. The last five columns (F,G,H,I,J) refer generally to both groups. The (X) indicates a positive response and the (—) a negative response. The numerals in parentheses refer to special circumstances which are explained following the chart. The subjects covered are:

- A. Special automotive privileges for disabled (civilian).
- B. Special plates or other identifying insignia issued.
- C. Fee exempt (or amount of fee).
- D. Special plate or other insignia issued to veteran.
- E. Fee exempt (or amount of fee).
- F. Special parking privilege provided under columns (A) and/or (D).
- G. Recipient must be actual owner.
- H. Recipient must be actual driver.
- I. Number of non veterans issued privilege.
- J. Number of veterans issued privilege.

State	Civilian			Vet			General			J
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	
Alabama	—	X	(1)	X	(2)	(3)	—	—	—	—
Arizona	—	X	X	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Arkansas	—	—	—	X	X	X	—	—	—	1,100
California	X	X	X	X	X	X	—	—	2,500	1,500
Colorado	—	—	—	X	X	X	—	—	—	1,400
Connecticut	X	X	X	X	X	X	—	(4)	1,200	500
Delaware	—	X	X	X	X	X	—	—	50	—
Florida	X	X	(5)	X	X	X	—	(6)	785	—
Georgia	—	—	—	X	(7)	(8)	—	—	—	—
Hawaii	—	—	—	—	(9)	—	X	X	—	79
Idaho	—	—	—	X	X	—	—	—	—	81
Illinois	—	—	—	X	X	—	—	—	—	2,200
Kansas	—	—	—	X	X	X	—	—	—	360
Kentucky	X	X	X	—	—	—	—	—	119	—
Louisiana	—	—	—	X	X	—	—	—	—	—
Maine	X	X	X	X	—	—	—	(10)	17	—
Maryland	—	—	—	X	(11)	—	—	—	2,816	—
Massachusetts	X	X	X	X	X	X	—	—	2,345	1,380
Michigan (12)	X	X	X	X	X	X	—	—	3,300	—
Minnesota	X	X	(13)	—	—	—	—	—	959	36
Nevada	X	X	(14)	—	—	(15)	—	—	—	61
New Hampshire	X	X	X	—	X	—	—	—	(16)	360
New Jersey	X	X	X	(17)	X	X	—	—	(18)	2,276
New Mexico	—	—	—	—	(19)	—	—	—	—	—
New York	—	—	—	(20)	(21)	—	—	—	—	1,000
North Carolina	X	X	(22)	—	(23)	(24)	—	X	—	42
North Dakota	X	X	X	X	(25)	X	—	—	—	265
Oklahoma	—	—	—	X	(26)	—	—	—	—	1,000
Oregon	X	X	X	—	—	X	—	—	—	100
Pennsylvania	X	X	X	—	X	X	—	—	—	2,650
Rhode Island	X	X	X	X	X	X	—	(27)	500	300
South Carolina	X	X	X	X	X	(28)	—	—	—	394
South Dakota	X	X	X	X	X	X	—	X	35	20
Tennessee	—	—	—	X	—	—	—	—	—	900
Utah	X	X	X	—	—	X	—	—	66	—
Vermont	—	—	—	—	X	—	—	—	—	—
Washington	X	X	X	—	X	X	—	—	400	—
West Virginia	—	—	—	—	(29)	—	—	—	—	229
Wisconsin	X	X	X	X	X	X	—	—	520	800

Where column (C) indicates an exemption from fee payment, it means that there is no special fee other than the regular registration fee. Where column (E) indicates exemption from fee payment, it means the veteran is exempt from payment of all fees, except as noted. Where there is one total figure under column (I), there were no figures available for veterans. Where one figure is noted between columns (I) and (J), the

sum includes both veterans and non veterans.

(1) \$1.00 fee for flag. (2) \$1.00 fee for special disabled veteran plates; no registration for disabled war veterans; regular fee for non-war veteran. (3) No discernible parking privileges. (4) Disabled civilian must be operator. Disabled veteran need not be. (5) 50¢ fee. (6) Veteran need not be actual driver. (7) Fee exempt for veterans who

receive auto grant. Fee payable for others. (8) No special parking privileges under state law, but are granted locally as indicated. (9) Exempt from license fee and vehicular taxes only. (10) The disabled civilian and the 100% service-connected veteran are required to be the operator of the car also. Under Section 320.084, the veteran need not be the driver. (11) Fee exempt for VA Grant recipients only. (12) Law applies equally to veteran and

civilian. (13) No fee for emblems, but \$1.00 fee for distress flag. (14) \$1.00 fee. (15) parking privileges not defined. (16) Disabled veteran need not be driver, but disabled civilian must be. (17) Veteran receives same insignia as civilian, but special plates are available through veterans organization. (18) In order to receive insignia, recipient need not be the owner. In order to receive free plates, veteran must be the owner. (19) Registration fee exempt for service-connected veteran, payable by others. (20) Special plates are available through veterans organizations. (21) Registration fee exempt for service-connected, payable by others. (22) Fee of \$2.00. (23) Fee of \$1.00. (24) The distress flag permits one to stop presumably to discharge the disabled person, but the law does not set forth or define parking privileges. (25) Special fee of \$1.00 for plates. (26) Registration free, but special fee of \$2.15 for plates. (27) Veteran need not be licensed to drive. (28) The significance of special plates is lost as there are no special parking privileges indicated. (29) Veteran is exempt from registration fee, but not from payment of privilege tax and certificate of title fee.

#### DEMOCRACY IN DRIBBLETS

### HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, October 15 was a portentous day in our Nation's recent history. It was a day that was frequently dramatic and occasionally inspirational in its evocation of the sincere and profound commitment of so many of our fellow citizens to peace in Vietnam. I say that this day was portentous and I say this advisedly, because the impact of this day remains to be felt. My own hopes are twofold. First, that the President will respond constructively to the national sentiment, in spite of his recent disclaimer, and increase the pace of our extrication from Vietnam. Second, and corollary, that the events of October 15 will signal the rejuvenation of nonviolent speech and assembly as an effective, as well as an appropriate, strategy of dissent. Too many voices in the land are shrieking that only violence brings results and that speech is for suckers. I hope that Moratorium Day can stand as impressive proof to the contrary.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to speak of these events in detail. Rather, I wish to speak of an equally portentous event that occurred right here in this Chamber on the evening of October 14. There occurred approximately 2 hours of high-level debate about the most important question dividing the country today. It was stimulating, it was instructive, and it was incisive. But on that same evening, this great body freely chose to violate not merely its own traditions, but a tradition and principle which this Nation has cherished and relied upon since its establishment. On that evening, the House of Representatives, after 2 hours of such debate chose to shut it off. Apparently, such democratic norms are heady stuff and can only be taken in small doses.

As every Member of this body must know, my distinguished and esteemed colleagues, the gentleman from Indiana

(Mr. JACOBS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL) had requested special orders for the evening of October 14, which was to be the occasion for a full and free debate on our Nation's policies and actions in Vietnam. This discussion was abortive because the House, in its wisdom, chose to adjourn, early in the proposed program of presentations, but after the open and constructive nature of the debate must have been demonstrated to the satisfaction of all.

I must candidly admit that I felt particularly aggrieved by the decision to adjourn because I was to have been one of the next speakers. There were arguments I wished to make, policies I wished to challenge and questions I wished to raise for consideration and discussion with my colleagues. I was not afforded the opportunity to do so, and I shall not try to minimize my disappointment. And there were many of our colleagues, more experienced and more insightful than I, who were similarly denied their opportunity to discuss our Vietnam dilemma directly with our colleagues and indirectly with all our fellow citizens.

But this is only a minor consideration in comparison with the truly distressing implications of the decision by this House to adjourn rather than to permit—and even cherish—the continuation of the debate.

There was some concern expressed at the beginning of the discussion that the debate would be a monolog dominated by those of us who are critical of our policies in Vietnam. But during the course of the early evening, two of my distinguished colleagues of Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI and Mr. ANDERSON) both graciously and accurately complimented the House on the fact that the discussion was both open and constructive—indeed, perhaps one of the most constructive debates of this current session.

As a Member of this House, therefore, I must express my profound disappointment that we refused to permit those who wished to remain the opportunity to continue this debate. But both as an elected official and as a private citizen concerned about the current high level of unrest in our country, my distress runs deeper.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that every Member of this House has frequently deplored the violence that has accompanied many recent protests against our national policies, both foreign and domestic. I am equally confident that all of us have counseled our constituents—particularly our younger constituents—that the right to dissent is a cherished privilege and responsibility, that the freedom of speech and assembly will continue to be protected vigilantly, and that dissent expressed peaceably and lawfully will be heard and, indeed, heeded to the extent that it is logically compelling and persuasive.

Mr. Speaker, the next time I am told that the proponents of some position or some cause have not had the opportunity to present their views freely and fully, I shall not reply by quoting the first amendment without first considering what we did here. The next time I am told that mere speech and free assembly

are insufficient and ineffective in expressing dissent, I must again consider what we did here. The next time I am told that our Government will not heed criticism, no matter how constructive and how well intentioned, I must once again consider what we did here. For what we did was to deny to ourselves in practice the same right of free speech and open dissent that we so proudly proclaim in rhetoric.

Mr. Speaker, I remain optimistic that our Government will listen and will respond. But the action of this body on October 14 has not made me more sanguine, and I must again express my profound dismay and disappointment.

#### ANTIWAR MORATORIUM

### HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, a few days before the antiwar moratorium demonstrations I made a statement to the press of my district giving my general feelings on those events. I would like at this point to reprint this statement, then make some additional observations which have come to mind since Wednesday's events. The statement was as follows:

The demonstrations planned for Wednesday can only give the appearance of indecision and disunity on the part of the United States and encourage North Vietnam to delay in making any serious efforts at peace negotiations.

Generally, I will support President Nixon in the conduct of the war as long as he is making every possible effort to bring this war to a close. And, I think he is making that effort.

I do not intend to participate in the moratorium. I will be at work on Wednesday, and I believe the majority of Americans will be, too. Nor will I make any speeches on the floor of the House in support of this demonstration. We have but one voice in this matter—the President's. It saddens me to see all these fragmented groups trying to establish this nation's international policy in the streets.

Our agreement with Viet Nam is one of some 50 international agreements the United States has with other nations. This is a vital commitment by the leader of the free world; if we do not see this one through, consider how we will have undermined this government's foreign policy for generations to come.

Although these demonstrators are sincere, their methods are just feeding the Communists. North Vietnam has exhibited an absolute unwillingness to negotiate because they are relying on the weakness and division created by things like this moratorium.

I believe perhaps public opinion on Vietnam is crystallizing along the lines of "get out or get in." This is a last resort position, but North Vietnam should know that this is a real possibility.

What distresses me the most is that the United States has won the major objective we set out to accomplish. We have stopped the spread of aggression in Southeast Asia and we have given the South Vietnamese the opportunity to create the kind of government they want and can support.

Mr. Speaker, now that the demonstrations of the moratorium have been held and relative calm has been restored, I



think it is well that we again review the problem facing this country. Again, we must all realize that in this free country, people have the right to dissent and express views as they did on moratorium day. The basic question remains, however, what is best for our country in the long run?

I am concerned that if this kind of trend of confrontation and disunity continues, we will see the course of the war being directed not by the obligations and commitments of the United States, but rather by the rule of the political expedient. We are withdrawing troops from Vietnam now, and I hope that future events allow this to continue. But I do not think we should allow ourselves to be driven to the position in which withdrawal will continue, regardless of the presence of justifiable moves on the other side. By justifiable moves, I mean either reciprocal "scaling down" gestures on the battlefield or progress in the Paris talks.

President Nixon in his latest news conference indicated that he hopes the United States will be out of Vietnam by 1970 or 1971. At one point, he is quoted as saying:

Once the enemy recognizes that it is not going to win its objectives by waiting us out, then the enemy will negotiate and we will end this war before the end of 1970. That is the objective we have.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that this statement might be borne out in events. I would hope that it is the kind of timetable that we might see. But at the same time, I question the approach of saying in one breath that our resolve is such that the enemy cannot wait us out, yet saying in another that we are making every effort to be out by 1970 or 1971.

Every patriotic American searches in his own heart and mind for a solution to the Vietnam problem. As I see it, our Government is the leader of the free world, and as such, we have given protection—and in turn, faith and hope—to the smaller nations of Southeast Asia. We have become involved more than we as a peace loving Nation want to be involved. But I believe, Mr. Speaker, there must always be some nation strong enough to maintain the peace. If the Vietnam involvement were strictly a nationalistic fight between the North and South Vietnamese, then our approach to the problem would be entirely different.

However, we became involved because the aggression against South Vietnam was another example of the aggression and mass slaughter of innocent people. Therefore, I think we were right in the giving of this help to South Vietnam. If it was right when we stopped this slaughter then it is right that we see this thing through to an honorable conclusion.

The moratorium did allow a lot of people to express their objections to the war, but the moratorium also has aroused in many Americans an even stronger feeling to "get all the way in or out." This would be a horror to contemplate. But, I sense a growing feeling on the part of many people that we should use all our force if peace is not obtained rather than move all our troops out abruptly.

The leaders in Hanoi should know this growing feeling of Americans and this same note of warning should be heard by Russia and China.

As long as President Nixon is making a valiant effort to obtain peace, the American people should support him. What concerns me is that he may pull the troops out too fast as an expediency, rather than as a reflection of a meaningful peace settlement.

#### NIXON PEACE PLAN DESERVES A CHANCE

### HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the State Journal of Lansing, Mich., in its editorial of Wednesday, October 15, on the occasion of the moratorium asserted "Nixon Peace Plan Deserves A Chance." In support of that view a number of persuasive arguments are made and I commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

#### NIXON PEACE PLAN DESERVES A CHANCE

Many thousands of persons from all walks of life participated today in one form or another against the continuation of the American involvement in the Vietnam War.

The Moratorium involves primarily sincere dissent of persons of all age groups who want to see this agonizing conflict halted. That is the one point upon which just about everyone seems to agree.

And so the big question remaining is, how? President Nixon, we believe, is no less anxious to see the war ended than anyone else. He has taken the initial steps through troop withdrawals, toning down the fighting and through appeals to Saigon and Hanoi to negotiate.

We believe the President will continue to move ahead with disengagement of American forces just as rapidly as it is possible to turn the burden of the military defense over to the South Vietnamese.

As columnist David Broder noted Tuesday, the President is, in fact, following the dove platform approved at the Democratic National Convention in 1968.

Yet, many of Nixon's critics now attack him for not moving fast enough and some are demanding an immediate withdrawal of all American forces and let the chips fall where they may.

The President inherited the war from another administration. It would have been easy enough for him, upon taking office, to simply take the steps that his severest critics now demand.

But to do so, he would have to cross off all American casualties as meaningless, and leave those thousands of South Vietnamese who have resisted or refused to join the Communists to the kind of fate which is now well known.

If President Nixon did this there is every reason to believe he would be savagely criticized and probably by some of the very same people who are now urging him to pull out of Vietnam immediately.

The Hanoi leaders thus far have not shown the slightest indication that they will negotiate on anything except their own terms.

Thus, in our view, President Nixon is taking the only reasonable course open to him. That is a gradual disengagement of U.S. forces while giving the South Vietnamese people time to take over the fight themselves.

No one can predict what this course will bring for the people of South Vietnam. But there is at least reason to hope that our allies in that country will hold their own and thus force the Communists to quit or negotiate.

There is little or no likelihood that that will happen if the President turns his back and walks out overnight as his more vocal critics now demand.

Again, everyone agrees that the American participation in this war must end as soon as possible.

We believe that the President is attempting to do exactly that, his critics to the contrary.

#### THOSE WHO HELP VIOLENCE

### HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is increasing evidence that the radical thrust behind much of today's unrest is being pushed from the far left. This is demonstrable in the case of some urban riot activity. It was also demonstrable at certain levels on the so-called moratorium day, October 15.

All thinking citizens favor improving our society, strengthening it, increasing our standard of living, providing greater opportunities to individual citizens, regardless of race, color, or religious preference. However, our society presently existing is not so bad as to justify urging that we burn down the barn to get out a few rats inside.

We had better take a good careful look at those who urge burning down the barns in America. In this connection, I commend the reading of the following article entitled "Ivory-Tower Activists" by Shirley Scheibla appearing in Barron's issue of October 13, 1969:

#### IVORY-TOWER ACTIVISTS IPS FELLOWS LEAD THE RADICAL THRUST FOR SOCIAL CHANGE

(By Shirley Scheibla)

WASHINGTON.—To judge by their public pronouncements, leaders of the Institute for Policy Studies (IPS) hold the view that demonstrations, boycotts and similar disruptive tactics are acceptable means of effecting revolutionary change in government; moreover, attempts by duly constituted authority to quell such activities, even when they prevent federal institutions from functioning effectively, constitute "repression."

No ivory-tower scholars, some of the principals of IPS have been as good as their word. Several have organized and participated in unruly demonstrations, while seven belong to the Committee to Defend the Conspiracy, organized in connection with the current trial of "the Chicago 8" on charges of conspiring to incite a riot during the 1968 Democratic National Convention. The Committee members, according to the September 1 issue of the newsletter *Combat*, included Marcus Raskin, IPS co-director; Arthur Waskow, senior fellow; Gar Alperovitz, Paul Goodman and Christopher Jencks, fellows; I. F. Stone, associate fellow; and Harold Taylor, an incorporator of the Peace Research Institute, now merged with IPS.

#### "CREATIVE DISORDER"

Writing in *New University Thought* last year, Mr. Waskow declared that the Institute is committed to the view that to develop social theory, one must be involved in social action and experiment. Toward this end, he advocated "creative disorder," which,

he said, means "to simply keep experimenting and to discover at what point one is neither smashed nor ignored, but creates enough change to move the society." Admitting a "gut preference for disorder," Mr. Waskow said IPS "stands on the bare edge of custom in the United States as to what an education research institution is."

In short, it not only develops and promulgates theories but also seeks to implement them. Aside from its failure so far in unilaterally disarming the U.S. (discussed last week in the first article in this series), IPS has enjoyed considerable success, even to the extent of Mr. Waskow being asked to give his expert advice on police problems in a project partially funded by the Justice Department.

The Institute actually has set up communes and neighborhood corporations with the ultimate aim of taking over important functions of municipal government, including the control of police, schools, housing for the poor and health services. According to at least one IPS book, *Neighborhood Government*, the message of the riots is that the poor want such community control, and civil war will result unless they get it. Nothing less will suffice, it maintains. The ultimate aim is to establish such control through a network of federally funded ghetto corporations.

#### HOLD GOVERNMENT POSTS

At least two IPS associate fellows hold government posts in which they are able to apply such theories. Other fellows, once having held such posts, apparently continue to influence the executive and legislative branches of government.

Anyone studying IPS and the turmoil plaguing the nation might be tempted to conclude that the Institute had written the scenario. According to *The Washington Post*, Mr. Waskow helped plan the demonstrations at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago. The subsequent need to call out the police to enable an institution of government to operate, and the resulting cries of police brutality, ran true to IPS theory espoused by Mr. Waskow and other exponents of the New Left affiliated with the Institute. Back in 1965, Mr. Waskow wrote in the *Saturday Review* that as revolutionists force tyranny to stop them, they will gain increasing acceptance.

According to the *Daily World*, Mr. Waskow also masterminded the counter-inauguration of a pig for president at the time of President Nixon's inauguration.

The Institute goes far beyond demonstrations in exercising influence. Its theory of community control through the device of neighborhood corporations has been set forth repeatedly by fellow Milton Kotler. A couple of years ago, the Urban Affairs Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress published two of his essays on the subject as part of a compendium by 22 urban specialists.

#### ENJOYS TAX EXEMPTION

A footnote identified Mr. Kotler as an IPS resident fellow. His opening sentences read: "At the outset, let me say that this paper is not a study. It is an argument . . . Intending to persuade you toward a course in urban legislation. . . ." (Nevertheless IPS has not registered as a lobbyist, and enjoys tax exemption as an educational institution.)

"Riots," wrote Mr. Kotler, "reflect the formation of a new local community power in combat with the established power. . . . Unless existing established federal, state and municipal governments transfer a proper portion of their authority in Negro communities, today's domestic warfare will grow."

(At about the time the essays were published, black employees of the Library of Congress began receiving cards. One side was headed, "Committee for Emergency Support," and bore the address of the Institute. It read, "We are in sympathy with the despair of the

black people in America. We share their sense of powerlessness to relieve repressive conditions by conventional political means. We are frustrated in our attempts to control the decisions which affect our lives in the capital city. We are all victims. We are ready in an emergency to assist the black community of Washington with food, housing, medical care and legal aid. We are committed to act to remove repressive military and political intervention."

The other side of the card advised calling the IPS phone number "in a riot or rebellion to obtain information, for legal assistance, for medical aid, for food and housing, to report police brutality" (Shortly thereafter Mr. Waskow began calling for the collection of bail funds in advance of violence.)

#### TRANSFER OF AUTHORITY

In his essays for the Committee, Mr. Kotler suggested a transfer of authority through "creative federalism." He explained, "The federal government must first assist the organization of legal neighborhood corporations with some initial funding. . . . Funding from the government is more important for legitimizing the development of neighborhood self-government as a unit of local rule in the society than for the money itself. . . . This proposal is already before the Senate in the form of Senate bill 1433. . . . It deserves your consideration and support."

SL1433 expired in 1967. But on July 11, 1968, Roy Innis, Acting National Director of CORE, and Representatives Charles E. Goodell (R., N.Y., now a Senator), William B. Widnall (R., N.J.) and Robert Taft, Jr. (R., Ohio) jointly introduced legislation to create community development corporations "to finance, acquire, own and manage productive business enterprise located in the community, and to use the profit from such enterprise to finance its own education and social service programs in the community."

Financing for the corporations, they explained, would come from community development banks (CDBs) "analogous to Federal Land Bank Associations and Production Credit Associations, under the supervision of the Comptroller of the Currency." They estimated that federal capitalization of the CDBs initially would involve annual federal spending of \$1 billion.

Last December the measure was discussed as a "self determination symposium" at the Washington Hilton Hotel. According to *The New York Times*, Senator Charles H. Percy (R., Ill.) told the gathering, which included black militants, that "Mr. Nixon had expressed approval of the concepts in the bill and that Nixon aides had informed him that the President-elect 'strongly supports the bipartisan concept.'"

#### PENDING BILL

That bill, of course, expired with the 90th Congress. Senator Goodell, however, now is revising a similar one he introduced this year which is pending before the Senate Finance Committee.

The impetus for all this began four years ago, according to an IPS booklet called "The First Three Years," when "after long discussions with Kotler, a number of residents and organizational leaders in a poor neighborhood decided to organize the East Columbus Citizens Organization (ECCO)." To date, the Office of Economic Opportunity has approved grants of \$432,219 for ECCO and expects funding eventually to total \$757,113. The agency calls it a demonstration of community self-government through a corporation.

OEO also has announced what it calls its "Community Capitalism Program"; under it, the agency plans to make grants of \$10 million this year to community corporations. (Mr. Kotler says there now are 70 of them.) Grants already made public include \$1 million to the Inner-City Business Improvement Forum (Detroit), \$900,000 to the Human Development Corp. (St. Louis), \$1.1 million

to the North Lawndale Economic Development Corp. (Chicago), \$600,000 to the Harlem Commonwealth Council (New York) and \$1.5 million to the Hough Area Development Corp. (Cleveland).

All this ties in too with the Model Cities program; by happenstance, Stanley L. Newman, an IPS associate fellow, is Chief of the Planning and Relocation and Public Administration Branch of the Division of Program Development and Evaluation in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for Model Cities and Governmental Relations.

#### EMINENT DOMAIN

Now Mr. Kotler is elaborating on his theory. In a book titled *Neighborhood Government*, just published by Bobbs-Merrill Co., he demands regulatory power for the community corporations to assure that money earned in the community will stay there. He also writes: "It is necessary for the corporation both to have the power to tax its residents and to be able to dispose of its territory. This means the governmental power of eminent domain." He says it also would be reasonable for the corporation "to control prices, rents, licensing and banking." Further, he would like communities to govern themselves based on custom rather than outside laws.

Calling the community "the action unit of this emerging revolutionary class," Mr. Kotler says, "The neighborhood organization . . . must be prepared to defend gains in jurisdiction by the threat of war to any who would endeavor to deny these gains."

Meanwhile, Mr. Waskow has pursued the IPS idea of community control of schools. Some years ago he became secretary of a community anti-poverty group here. The Adams-Morgan Community Council, just as federal policy-makers insisted that the D.C. Board of Education allow the Council to run the Morgan grammar school as an experiment in community control.

Shortly thereafter, John R. Immer, president of the Federation of Citizens Association of the District of Columbia, wrote President Johnson that the children at the school were being cheated out of a good education. He declared: "The teachers maintain no discipline, are hippies, use vile language, have had little or no teaching experience and have and are using untried teaching methods."

#### CAMELOT PATRONS

Nevertheless, President Johnson's cabinet officers and their wives worked with Mr. Waskow in the presentation of the movie, "Camelot," at the Warner theater in Washington, as a benefit for the Morgan school. Among the patrons listed by Mr. Waskow were (then) Justice and Mrs. Abe Fortas (IPS lists his former law partner, Thurman Arnold, as one of its original trustees), Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, Attorney General Ramsey Clark, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of Commerce Alexander B. Trowbridge and Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman.

Federal support also has been forthcoming for a new venture in higher education in which Mr. Waskow will play a significant role. The Justice Department recently agreed to underwrite loans and grants to students pursuing programs at a new Center for the Administration of Justice at American University in Washington. According to AU President George H. Williams, "The initial award (from Justice) exceeds \$200,000, and anticipated funding for the academic year may exceed \$500,000."

William M. McDowell, AU information officer, told Barrow's that Mr. Waskow has been asked to serve as an expert consultant to the Center on how it can best serve the Washington community and that he may occasionally lecture on police problems.

Writing in a local underground newspaper, the *Quicksilver Times*, last July, Mr. Waskow advocated: "(1) Neighborhood control of



police through citizen-elected commissions. (2) Creation of countervailing organizations such as unions of those policed. (3) Changing the role of the professional, tough cop to one of a more everyday civil servant doing his job, keeping the peace, rather than enforcing the law." A year ago, according to press reports, Mr. Waskow headed a rally here in front of the 13th police precinct station to demand immediate community control of the police.

To develop ways of establishing community control of health services, IPS held a seminar three years ago under the direction of Dr. William Kissick, associate fellow and then Chief of the Division of Public Health Methods in the Office of the Surgeon General of the U.S. (Dr. Kissick now is teaching at the University of Pennsylvania.)

#### BACKGROUND MATERIAL

According to Pierce Rollins, Acting Director of Information for the Office of Community Health Service of the Public Health Service (PHS), the material resulting from the conferences in that seminar has been compiled in two volumes by the Milbank Memorial Foundation. Mr. Rollins says the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, parent agency of PHS, uses the volumes as background material prepared by experts to help it set health policy.

The official explains that PHS now is funding the planning of health services at state, area, city and community levels, and that the various entities are free to subcontract with IPS experts to help in the planning.

The general idea, Mr. Rollins adds, is to fund community health services only after area-wide planning. But because of the desperate need, PHS is making funds available without area planning. It has financed, he says, 22 community health centers and others for rat control and the treatment of venereal disease. So far PHS has made 2,500 health planning grants, Mr. Rollins reports.

Tangible results also have emanated from a 1968-69 IPS seminar conducted by Rick Margolies, an associate fellow. According to the Institute, it aimed "at developing a theory of social change based upon the possibility of a movement of small groups living communally and acting as agents of change in their larger environment. It is assumed that the small group will begin to live in the manner it wishes the society at large to adopt. . . . Some individual seminars will be theoretical and historical, while others will be more specifically programmatic. The first section, 'Toward a New Life Style,' will include discussions of human communion and human need, the extended family and child rearing. . . . 'The History of Intentional Communities' will include American 'utopian' experiments, communist collectives and communes, the Kibbutzim; 'Toward a Praxis of Community' will synthesize lessons learned in the above sections and work toward a plan for a communitarian movement."

#### INSURGENT ACTIVITIES

Mr. Margolies told Barron's that he now has communes in operation in the Adams-Morgan area of Washington. After starting with money from the Stern Family Foundation, commune members now support themselves by working part-time at the Quick-silver Times and the Washington Free Press, another underground newspaper, Mr. Margolies explained. Among other things, the Free Press has printed detailed instructions on how to conduct "insurgent activities." Now Mr. Margolies is preparing a new magazine, to be called *The People in the Streets*.

In view of the success of IPS in developing and implementing theories, its present studies and projects for the future take on added significance. One plan is to set up a network of institutes like IPS all over the country to serve as counter-institutions to established ones. Gar Alperovitz, IPS fellow

and former legislative assistant to Senator Gaylord A. Nelson (D., Wis.), already has launched one at Cambridge, Mass., with the help of Christopher Jencks, IPS fellow and Harvard professor.

According to Tina Smith, IPS administrative assistant, Alan Haber and Barry Welsberg are setting up a Bay Area Institute in San Francisco. Gerry Hunnius, having just completed an IPS study of "the possibility of workers' control of factories based on Yugoslav model," now is in Toronto exploring the possibility of setting up an institute. Miss Smith says IPS also is discussing the possibility of setting up one in the South.

Also on the agenda for IPS is "investigations of operations of foreign aid." Handily, Jack Heller, an associate fellow, is director of the Office of Development Programs for the Bureau of Latin America of the Agency for International Development.

A project listed in the IPS 1969-70 budget is a "Middle-East Peace Mission," under the direction of Cherif Guellal, IPS fellow, and Algerian Ambassador to the U.S. until his country broke off diplomatic relations.

#### WENT TO AFRICA

About a year ago, Ivanhoe Donaldson, IPS fellow and member of SNCC, went to Africa for IPS to study self-government there and to contact members of the African National Congress and Pan African Congress. Now his assignment is to set up liaison with both groups, "in order to make accurate information available to American educational institutions on both secondary and college levels."

The IPS assignment for fellow Frank Smith is "to set up a chain of cooperative food markets in an effort to bolster the concept of community control by trying to develop viable and democratic models for community control of food, shelter and clothing businesses." Mr. Smith, who formerly served as Coordinator of the Community Staff of the notorious Child Development Group of Mississippi (Barron's, September 26 and October 24, 1966), is a member of SNCC, CORE and the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party.

All last summer, IPS had several students interviewing the members and staff of the Federal Communications Commission and studying public records. As a result, the Institute now has elaborate plans for challenging the licenses of broadcasting stations, particularly when it doesn't consider them responsive enough to the views of the New Left.

#### THOMAS BROWN, JR., KILLED IN VIET HELICOPTER CRASH

#### HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Army WO Thomas F. Brown, Jr., a fine young man from Maryland died recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend his courage and to honor his memory, by including the following article in the RECORD:

#### THOMAS BROWN, JR., KILLED IN VIET HELICOPTER CRASH

Army WO Thomas F. Brown, Jr., of Forestville, Md., was killed in a helicopter crash in South Vietnam October 10, Pentagon officials reported yesterday.

Mr. Brown was piloting the craft on a "military mission" when it crashed near the 1st Air Cavalry base at Phuoc Vinh, South Vietnam.

Before going to Vietnam six weeks ago, Mr. Brown trained at several bases in this coun-

try and concluded his pilot training at Fort Hunter, Ga.

A native of Washington, he graduated in 1966 from Crossland Senior High School in Temple Hills, Md.

While in high school he met his future bride, the former Patricia J. Chochola, whom he married May 30, 1969.

Mr. Brown attended Prince Georges County Community College for two years before enlisting in the Army.

In a letter to his wife, he said he was "proud" to be in Vietnam and he wished that every American could go to Vietnam "to see how good we have it back here."

Survivors include his wife; his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas F. Brown, Sr., of Morningside Md.; two brothers, William G. Brown and Steven G. Brown; and two sisters, Helene N. Brown and Kathy L. Brown, all of Morningside.

#### A PEACE DEMONSTRATOR DENOUNCES THE STUDENT FAST FOR FREEDOM COMMITTEE

#### HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I, WILLIAM L. CLAY, private citizen, taxpayer, veteran of the Korean war, father of a 13-year-old son, Member of Congress, American, wish to take sharp issue with the student Fast for Freedom Committee. This committee has accused me of "advancing the victory of totalitarian communism." The committee even implies that my action in supporting the October 15 moratorium may "insure the slaughter of many thousands of innocent civilians" in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I know precisely why American troops should not be in Vietnam. I challenge the student fasters to document a reasonable basis for them to be there.

I am in favor of American withdrawal because 859 of my fellow Missourians have been slaughtered for some imaginative, self-righteous proclamation. I am for American withdrawal because more than 40,000 Americans have sacrificed their lives in a war which was conceived, designed, approved, and executed by less than 20 people in our country.

To those who say that opposition to the war in Vietnam is un-American, I say it is un-American to spend \$77 billion on defense and only \$3 billion on education. It is un-American to spend \$5 billion on the C5-A airplane and less than \$2 billion on the poverty program. It is un-American to spend \$40 billion on space exploration and only \$186 million on cancer research. It is un-American to spend \$20,000 for the ammunition to kill each Vietcong and only \$53 a year to educate each American child. Yes, somebody is un-American but it is not the war protesters.

Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the student fasters who are so greatly concerned about the freedom of the people of South Vietnam the fact that the manpower, the armed forces, and the natural resources of both North and South Vietnam are equal in every respect. I

further contend, Mr. Speaker, that if the people of South Vietnam are as interested in freedom as the student fasters say they are, then they can and will fight and win it.

Mr. Speaker, if the student fasters are truly committed to "self-determination" for the Vietnamese then our troop withdrawal would provide them with exactly that decision. Would they determine to fight against Communist aggression and dictatorial rule or would they determine that a potential dictatorship of the government from the north would be no worse than the actual dictatorship they now live under in the south.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I wish to pose two questions to those of the student fast for freedom who embrace the concept that Vietnam communism is so reprehensible and repugnant that Americans must destroy it at the cost of American lives. I ask, Mr. Speaker, how does Vietnamese communism differ from the communism of Russia, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, or Rumania? If we are really in Vietnam to preserve freedom and liberty and to assure self-determination by the majority of the people in that country, why are American troops not now dying in the Union of South Africa and Rhodesia where evidently freedom and liberty of the majority have been suppressed by a minority?

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I honestly suspect the vociferous proclamations for freedom and liberty 12,000 miles from America to be for lack of a better word idle "jawboning." In light of this, millions of black Americans are this very day being denied that same freedom and liberty in our homeland.

Since the committee of student fasters would on this very day deny me the freedom to speak and dissent, I question whether the South Vietnamese could truly appreciate the kind of freedom espoused for them by this committee.

#### NATIONAL BUSINESS WOMEN'S WEEK

### HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, this is National Business Women's Week. This gives us the opportunity once again to congratulate the National Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs, which held its 50th anniversary convention in St. Louis this past summer. The growth of this organization has paralleled the ever-increasing contribution of women to the business and professional life of our Nation. The organization today has more than 180,000 members in 3,800 clubs in every State of the Union, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

In paying merited tribute to the National Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs, we also are indirectly recognizing efforts of all the more than 29 million women who may be found working in almost every occupa-

tion in the United States. Few occupations were open to women around the turn of the century. Now few, if any, are closed to them. This fact tells more than a thousand words about the accomplishments of women in the last half century.

#### DARTMOUTH—ACADEMIC FREEDOM DENIED

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, extremists at Dartmouth College have shattered the institution's image as a libertarian, intellectual community. For the first time in the history of the college, free speech has been denied on its campus.

Dr. William Shockley, Nobel laureate, and a scientist of Stanford University, was prevented from delivering an address before a meeting of the National Academy of Sciences whose members were invited guests on the campus. Reportedly, Dr. Shockley's subject was one on which he is well qualified to speak and entitled to be heard—"Offset Analysis Description of Racial Differences."

Because of the disgraceful conduct of a militant little band of "civil righters," inquiring minds—searching for truth, and not being satisfied to accept contemporary liberal dogma and taboos—will now be compelled to contact Dr. Shockley to obtain a copy of his report in order to learn what the Dartmouth students so greatly feared they would have it suppressed. Perhaps, if order could have been maintained, they would have learned whether or not their behavior merely demonstrated the accuracy of Dr. Shockley's report.

However, since Dr. Shockley's report is concerned with intelligence, it probably remains for other scientists to conduct studies related to Dr. Shockley's to determine whether the students proved the validity of his thesis.

With its students shrouded by superstitious fears, Dartmouth's intellectual community is retrogressed to the dark ages where unreason prevails and discourse is suppressed.

Mr. Speaker, one of the few newspapers in our country carrying a full report of this travesty of a free society was the courageous Manchester Union Leader of Manchester, N.H.

The Union Leader report and editorial follow:

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Oct. 16, 1969]

DISRUPTIONS PREVENT DARTMOUTH SPEECH: SHOCKLEY DENIED RIGHT TO SPEAK (By Joe Duggan)

HANOVER.—A "disappointed" physicist and Nobel prizewinner, Dr. William Shockley, yesterday left Dartmouth College campus en route back to California after being refused by demonstrating negro students the opportunity to deliver a controversial scientific paper.

About 30 negro students in an audience of more than 200 persons stood to loudly applaud when Dr. Shockley was introduced

to deliver his paper to the National Academy of Sciences meeting at the morning session. At first, the rest of the audience joined in and then stopped, but the negro students, seated down in front of the Steele Hall auditorium, didn't stop, but remained standing and applauding drowning out any attempt by Dr. Shockley to be heard.

Other faculty members failed to break up the demonstration until Prof. John G. Kemeny wrote on the slate board in front of the speakers platform pleading for an opportunity to speak.

Dr. Kemeny wrote "I am chairman of the Committee on Equal Opportunity. If you do not let me speak, you are ruining all the gains so far." The clapping stopped and Professor Kemeny pleaded with them to let Dr. Shockley be heard.

Then Prof. Jonathan Mirsky moved in and spoke, directing his remarks to those whites present. Mirsky sympathized with the negro demonstrators but the clapping resumed directly after his remarks and lasted a considerable time afterward.

Discussion groups then took place as faculty members attempted to negotiate with the negro students, but the disruption passed the hour mark and at 12 noon, NAS chairman and Dartmouth Chemistry Prof. Walter H. Stockmayer, formally accepted Dr. Shockley's paper without presentation and adjourned the NAS meeting.

Just before the adjournment, Dartmouth's new dean, Carroll Brewster, spoke to the audience and expressed his concern at preventing Dr. Shockley from speaking.

"What has happened here is so grave that I find it difficult to express my concern. You all know how I and most of us feel on this issue. But you don't fight an idea by trying to hide an idea and give it currency," Dean Brewster said.

"We had an opportunity here to expose bad thinking, but in losing this opportunity we have all lost," he said. The dean indicated he would summon an all-college convocation to discuss this critical breach of free speech.

There was no indication from any faculty member present that any disciplinary measures would be taken against the protesting students. It was brought out that the 30 negroes were a small representation of the 170 on campus.

Dr. Shockley's paper, "Offset Analysis Description of Racial Differences" was the last of five scientific papers being presented in the concluding session of the three-day NAS fall meeting at Dartmouth.

The morning meeting started in a Wilder Hall lecture room, but as students began to fill the building just prior to the final paper to be given by Dr. Shockley, Prof. Stockmayer shifted the meeting to a larger hall next door in Steele Hall, in order to give everyone a chance to hear Dr. Shockley.

Fears were voiced earlier that members of Students for a Democratic Society might try to disrupt Dr. Shockley's presentation but the 30 negro students apparently surprised all and stole the thunder away from the SDS.

It was the first time at Dartmouth College that a speaker had been refused a chance to speak. Embarrassing to Dartmouth was the fact that Dr. Shockley, a member of the National Academy of Sciences, was delivering an address to Academy members—who were invited guests of the college. It was declared not the same as if Dr. Shockley was simply a visiting lecturer.

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Oct. 17, 1969]

SAVAGES TAKE OVER AT DARTMOUTH (By William Loeb)

Last Wednesday at Dartmouth there occurred an utterly disgraceful denial of free speech to no less than Nobel laureate Dr.



William Shockley of Stanford University. Dr. Shockley was attending the meeting of the National Academy of Sciences at Dartmouth and was scheduled to give a speech on "Offset Analysis Description of Racial Differences." But, he was never allowed to make the speech.

After being introduced, the Stanford University professor rose to speak and was met by "applause" led by some 30 black savages who currently are called "students" at Dartmouth. And, they never did allow Dr. Shockley to be heard. So, eventually, the professor had to abandon his attempts to speak.

Of course, any individual, white as well as black, who prevents an invited speaker to a college campus from being heard flouts not only the civil rights of every American to be heard but also desecrates the concepts of academic freedom and open discussion.

Actually, the savages, black or white, who behave in this fashion negate the very concept of a university—to encourage the inquiring mind. Freedom of study and inquiry becomes impossible under circumstances where witch doctors and jungle methods are allowed to prevail.

This newspaper feels quite sure, however, that the faculty and administration of Dartmouth, while embarrassed, will do nothing except possibly to apply a slight slap on the wrist to the anti-intellectual savages who destroyed the right of Dr. Shockley to be heard.

Until Dartmouth and other U.S. colleges and universities take severe steps against those who use brute force to allow only what they approve to be said, thought, and inquired into on a university campus, the universities of this nation will not only be intellectually desecrated but also they will be worthless as educational institutions.

The permissive, gutless faculties and administrations and the trustees of the universities, by their moral and intellectual cowardice, are doing nothing less than digging the graves of these institutions and, in a very real sense, their own. Such a climate will continue to worsen. And, the next time it may not be Dr. Shockley. Any professor, any administrator who has gone against the wishes of the black and white mobs will suffer.

The incident at Dartmouth is a disgrace to that institution which Daniel Webster loved so well, but it should come as no surprise after the outrageous treatment accorded the former governor of Alabama, George Wallace, or the seizure of the administration building last year.

It is quite clear that freedom and honest intellectual inquiry at Dartmouth are dead and will remain so until the anti-intellectual savages, white as well as black, are dismissed from the university.

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Oct. 16, 1969]

#### DARTMOUTH OFFICIALS PRAISED BY SHOCKLEY

HANOVER.—Dr. William Shockley took time before leaving here yesterday to praise the Dartmouth College faculty and administration for their handling of the protest demonstration that in unprecedented action kept him from delivering a scientific paper before the National Academy of Sciences meeting.

The Nobel laureate, who said he couldn't imagine how the situation might have been handled by officials any other way, described the incident as "a symptom of the times."

The physicist said there had to be a complete "lack of faith in the power of the mind to deal with a general problem." Dr. Shockley was prevented from making a presentation of a controversial topic concerning racial differences between white and negro.

Before boarding his afternoon flight enroute back to the West Coast he added "I was far more disappointed that I was not given a chance to deliver my paper."

#### FALSE ECONOMIZING

### HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the necessity for taking immediate steps to curb rising inflation is indisputable. It is imperative, however, that the measures we adopt in effecting this goal be carefully considered. We cannot afford to economize on the welfare of the American people, although it would appear that this is exactly what is happening.

The following editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer, October 15, 1969, points out the perils of following a course of misdirected economizing:

#### NO SAVINGS IN SCIENCE CUTBACKS

Efforts in the White House and in Congress to save government money are misdirected when applied severely to agencies which foster discovery and progress in the sciences and thereby make Americans' lives healthier and more liveable.

All the serious talk of holddowns in current and future budgets for support of research and training has alarmed leaders in science and medicine. They should be alarmed, and so should all citizens who recognize that the state of the nation and the condition of its people tomorrow depend in large part upon what is done today.

The now bleak outlook for the primary agencies which spur scientific advancement is well described in a report this week by Victor Cohn of the Washington Post staff. He made special note of these points:

A House appropriations subcommittee has cut \$80 million from the Nixon budget request for \$500 million for the National Science Foundation which supports investigation and training in the physical sciences.

The same Nixon budget reduces by \$290 million the \$1.93 billion allotted last year to the National Institutes of Health for biomedical and health projects, study and training.

Cohn reports the concern of leaders in the scientific and medical communities over ill-advised attempts to save government money. They protest that budget cuts would not only prevent new undertakings—they would cause projects already underway to be abandoned. Still other worthwhile programs would be adversely affected because reduced budgets make no allowance for inflation-pushed cost increases.

The head of the Association of American Medical Colleges, Dr. John Cooper, says cuts in research and training grants would do great harm to the nation's medical schools which need the grants to survive and grow. Grants account for upwards of 40% of the medical schools' total income.

Budget cuts also pose a threat to important National Institutes work dealing with many fatal and disabling ailments—heart disease, cancer, diabetes and arthritis, to name a few. And that is not all. Other authorities agree with Dr. Cooper's view that cutdowns in research and training grants discourage those who might choose to make academic medicine their life's work. The peril to medical faculties, needed to train more people to meet the health needs of an ever-increasing population, appears very real.

Congress and the White House should pay attention to what respected men of science and medicine are saying about reductions in the level of federal support for research and training. Economy affecting the future good health of Americans is false economy.

#### PUBLIC LEERY ABOUT ATOMIC POWER

### HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, an article in the October 19 Washington Post by staff writer Victor Cohn reports on the nuclear power issue in Minnesota. The State of Minnesota is seeking to impose standards which are tougher than those required by the AEC for regulating the release of radioactive waste from nuclear power plants. Mr. Cohn also comments on the Symposium on Nuclear Power and the Public, held at the University of Minnesota on October 10-11.

The public is becoming increasingly concerned about the potential health hazards and risks to the environment that are associated with atomic power. Furthermore, many citizens have begun to question the propriety of one Government agency, the AEC, acting both as the promoter of nuclear power and the regulator of nuclear power safety.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of the Minnesota case, I call Mr. Cohn's article to the attention of my colleagues:

#### PUBLIC FIGHTS A-POWER

(By Victor Cohn)

MINNEAPOLIS.—Minnesota has looked at the atom and found it partly evil.

On the verge of what seems an inevitable age of nuclear power, citizens here—citizens in several states, in fact—are starting afresh with this form of energy.

They are rediscovering the fact, known in bomb testing, that using the atom has a price. The price is an inevitable addition, "slight" or "great" depending on whom you ask, to the quiet violence that modern man does to air, water, land, and himself.

The price has led the state of Minnesota into a grim legal confrontation with the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. It is a fight—"a landmark fight," say federal and power industry officials—that threatens the growth of atomic power, threatens AEC regulatory authority all over the country and challenges the AEC's very doubleheaded structure as both promoter and protector in atomic matters.

To put it simply, Minnesota wants to be tougher than the AEC in regulating release of radioactive waste into the air and water. Minnesota Gov. Harold LeVander—middle road conservative who is far from a crusader in other areas—is deeply committed to this. At a recent National Governors Conference, he won the unanimous support of fellow governors, Republican and Democratic.

The issue will be examined by the Joint Senate-House Committee on Atomic Energy at six days of hearings in Washington starting Oct. 28. But it is already being examined by state officials and many citizens in Minnesota, Maryland, Vermont, New York State and the metropolitan New York City area, Illinois, Oregon and Colorado.

Since the Nov. 9, 1965, New York power blackout—Black Tuesday—"a handful of people have successfully delayed or blocked every major power plant proposed for the New York area," complained a recent double-page ad in the New York Times. The ad was inserted by the McGraw-Hill power industry magazine Electrical World, which complains, with the industry, that power-makers are suddenly caught in America's new

awareness that pollution imperils man's survival.

#### A SYMBOL FOR POLLUTION

The public, AEC Chairman Glenn T. Seaborg points out, is "uptight about the environment." At the same time, the United States is growing so fast and using so much electricity—for air conditioning, electronic computing and home hair drying—that generating capacity, more than doubled just since 1950, must double again by 1980 and more than triple by 1990.

At the same time, nuclear energy—until recently an expensive experiment—finally seems to be coming into its own. Today only 1 per cent of U.S. electricity is nuclear-generated, but the AEC says the figure will be 50 per cent by the year 2000. Seventy-nine civilian A-power plants are now on order or building.

"It isn't fair," complained an atomic industry public relations man at a University of Minnesota nuclear power conference, a conference inspired by the nuclear fight. "The militant conservationists are not doing much about the automobile. They're not all that excited over the coal- and oil-burning power plants that are putting out sulphur dioxide and other ugly chemicals. But they're after us. They've made us a symbol."

"Indeed we have," a Minnesota militant replied. "If we can win this one, if we can arouse the people over this kind of pollution, maybe we can arouse them over others."

What one AEC commissioner terms the "antinuclear movement" began, in this state of lakes and streams, when Northern States Power Co.—slogan, "Electricity is Penny Cheap"—began building a big 560-megawatt atomic plant near Monticello, on the fresh-flowing Mississippi River just north of Minneapolis and St. Paul.

At first, all went swimmingly. Then Northern States Power sought a waste disposal permit from the new Minnesota Pollution Control Agency. The agency, needed by a set of young University of Minnesota biologists, engaged Dr. Ernest C. Tsvoglou, professor of sanitary engineering at Georgia Tech, as a consultant.

Tsvoglou, chief of radiological water pollution control in the U.S. Public Health Service from 1956 to 1966, acknowledged that nuclear plants in the United States commonly discharge only a small percentage of the radioactive contaminants that the AEC would permit. Northern States Power in fact said it would discharge no more than 1 to 4 percent of the radioactivity that the AEC would allow.

Tsvoglou also acknowledged that the AEC has prudently set its standards in accordance with recommendations of both the Federal Radiation Council, representing several federal agencies, and expert national and international bodies.

But he argued that knowledge of the effects of low-level radiation is highly imperfect, and future research may turn up new harm. He said that radiation should be more strictly limited in order to leave a reserve in case of future nuclear accidents or resumed atomic weapon tests in the atmosphere. He looked to the day when atomic plants will dot the shores of the Mississippi and other U.S. waters, each adding its share of radioactive effluents. Northern States Power already is building two more big nuclear plants side by side at Prairie Island, south of Minneapolis-St. Paul, and has revealed plans for still more.

In effect, therefore, Tsvoglou recommended a set of standards at about 2 per cent of the AEC level. And in May, the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency issued Northern States Power an operating permit specifying such standards.

The company said it could meet the new standards almost all the time, but occasionally might have to exceed them. It said it would have to modify its plant and shut

it down more frequently to adjust to them, and additional annual operating expenses would be a prohibitive \$3.5 million a year, making future electricity slightly more than penny cheap in the upper Midwest.

#### THE PUBLIC'S ROLE

Northern States Power has sued the state of Minnesota in both state and federal courts, charging that its restrictions are unjustified and illegal. Nuclear power plant builders like Westinghouse and General Electric and even publicly managed utilities such as the Tennessee Valley Authority have rallied to Northern States Power's support.

And leaders of the congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—in particular Rep. Chet Holifield (D-Calif.), chairman, and Rep. Craig Hosmer (R-Calif.), ranking minority member—have sharply and impatiently questioned Minnesota's action.

Appearing on the University of Minnesota power conference platform, Hosmer firmly said that Congress has "pre-empted" the field of nuclear regulation for the federal government as one too complicated for state-by-state action. He and others said that where states have exercised radiation controls—as in uranium mining and in medical X-raying—they have done miserably.

But also, he charged, the Minnesota issue is "a big political football—certainly it is among the Minnesota delegation in Congress." He attacked "the professors around here who have been sounding off in the newspapers" and "Minnesota's underexperienced do-it-yourself stab at visceral regulation."

He said any complaints about radiation standards should go to the Federal Radiation Council. "They're not a subject for public rallies and placard making," he said, and "you can't have 200 million people deciding" them.

In reply, Dr. Barry Commoner of St. Louis—Washington University biologist and environmental crusader—said "informed public opinion" should indeed rule, even to accepting or rejecting a particular plant.

"The public is entitled to this vote," agreed Prof. Harold Green of George Washington University's National Law Center, a former AEC associate general counsel. "Why, in a democracy, should the public not have the full opportunity to decide for itself, rationally or irrationally, what benefits it wants and what price it is willing to pay?"

#### SCIENTISTS DISAGREE

Conference discussion then centered on that price: the alleged hazards or virtual lack of hazards of power plant radiation. There were scientists on both sides.

Commoner and Dr. Arthur Tamplin of the University of California's Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at Livermore emphasized hazards. Commoner saw a possible U.S. increase in thyroid cancer of several hundred cases a year from power plant radiation escaping into the environment. Tamplin said nuclear plants now measure only overall radioactivity, but particular radionuclides—individual elements or their radiation-produced daughters—may cause greater than average harm.

He pointed to tritium, a heavy form of hydrogen, chemically inseparable from ordinary hydrogen. Once in human cells, it becomes part of the human heritage—incorporated into the DNA that tells future cells and future children how to grow. He said AEC standards should be made more strict, individual radionuclides should be monitored and almost no plant wastes should be discharged into rivers. Instead, he said, all should be buried in atomic graveyards.

Dr. Stanley Auerbach of Oak Ridge National Laboratory and Dr. Merrill Eisenbud, New York City environmental protection administrator and former AEC official, replied: "Man lives in a radioactive environment," absorbing radiation all the time from cosmic rays, building materials, and the earth. Radiation from A-power plants can add only a

few percentage points more. Despite many bugaboos, there is no laboratory or medical evidence of any ill effects of low-level radiation, they argued.

Other possible power plant dangers were discussed: their considerable "thermal pollution" from the discharge of hot water, as well as possible plant accidents—"a remote danger," it was generally agreed, but a horrendous one. On each point, some speakers saw little problem, others peril.

When scientists disagree, concluded lawyer Green, the public and public bodies must decide. But the AEC, he maintained, has "a bifurcated interest," a "conflict of interest" in acting by congressional mandate as both A-power's developer and salesman and its government regulator.

He told how AEC officials, once they decide a plant is safe, become its enthusiastic supporters and defenders. "Clearly," said Commoner, "standard setting belongs in the hands of an agency concerned with all aspects of the environment," such as the Department of Health, Education and Welfare's Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Services.

S. David Freeman, director of energy policy for Dr. Lee Dubridge, President Nixon's science adviser, agreed that this policy issue "deserves thoughtful consideration."

Again and again at the Minnesota conference, Rep. Hosmer bristled. "It is time," he said, "that people quit painting the AEC as some kind of a nuclear Mafia engaged in a vast conspiracy." Even gentlemanly AEC Commissioner James T. Ramey said Minnesota "is making a mountain out of a molehill."

#### SOME NEW DIRECTIONS

Yet out of the Minnesota fight there may come some agreements or at least some new directions for nuclear power.

Commoner, Hosmer and Freeman agreed that environmental licensing and monitoring ought to encompass all kinds of power plants, not just A-plants.

Radiation standards in one way or another will probably be toughened. Northern States Power and the state of Minnesota are discussing a compromise which would in effect establish the right of a state to talk tough to powermakers. "There is not much question in my mind but that limits [of radiation tolerance] will be decreased as time goes on," said Dr. Carroll Zable of the University of Houston, until recently chairman of the AEC's important Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards. "We are looking at them," Ramey conceded.

This high-energy civilization needs to keep looking at other sources of power, not just the atom. Unless more and more power is provided us, we will flick the switch one day soon but nothing will happen. "There is no doubt in my mind," said Prof. Green, "that if in 1946 we had created a similar commission and joint committee to maximize the use of fossil fuels without polluting the environment, we would not need to rush so to build nuclear plants today."

The concern of the "new militant" environmentalists has only begun. "I assure you, gentlemen of the atomic power industry, you are not the targets," said Prof. Commoner. "All polluters are."

Gov. Tom McCall of Oregon has announced a nuclear power conference for Dec. 4-5. "I expect there will be a need for additional ones," patiently said AEC Commissioner Ramey.

"We are," Commoner thought, "in the midst of a revolution in public attitudes toward the moral acceptability of a level of environmental deterioration which has for a long time been accepted without general complaint." If this is true, the future will see more and more placarding about DDT, offshore drilling, gigantic accident-prone oil tankers and even, it may be, pollution-belching cars.



It may even see placards about people. The Minnesota conference's oldest speaker was white-haired M. King Hubbard, U.S. Geological Survey research geophysicist and respected world authority on man's resources. He spoke for developing new, advanced forms of nuclear reactors—breeder reactors—to conserve man's richest atomic fuels. But he pointed out that the nuclear fight, like the pollution fight, depends ultimately on control of man himself: "It is mandatory that we stabilize human population at some level we can live with—and we may even have to drop the population back to some livable level."

#### THE WIDESPREAD FEELING HELD BY PEOPLE IN THE HEARTLAND OF AMERICA

#### HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, following are two editorials and an editorial page column which indicate the widespread feeling held by people in the heartland of America.

I commend these pieces from the Omaha World-Herald and the Bellevue Press in Bellevue, Nebr., to the attention of my colleagues and all others who receive and read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

#### AFFIRMATION DAY

On this page today David Broder of the Washington Post Service states plainly and chillingly the danger this country will be in if the attack upon President Nixon's handling of the Vietnam war is successful.

The aim of the President's opponents is to break him on this issue by creating the impression at home and abroad that the country does not support him.

Irresponsibility is to be expected among campus militants. If they can create the impression that the antiwar protest of a fraction of the nation's seven million college students is the voice of 200 million Americans, so much the better from their point of view.

But the battle in Congress involves men of whom more is expected. President Nixon has begun the withdrawal of American combat troops; the withdrawal of many more or all of them is in prospect. The withdrawals have been accompanied by a lowering of the draft call.

The direction in which the President is moving is inescapable: Under the most difficult circumstances the President is trying to end American participation in the war and resolve that war by negotiation in Paris and the buildup of effective South Vietnamese military strength.

The men in Congress who are battling the President are acting as if nothing in Vietnam policy had changed since the departure of Lyndon Johnson and that the words and actions of Richard Nixon are meaningless or even fraudulent.

The contemptuous response of a number of senators to Nixon's plea for a 60-day moratorium on criticism of his war policies was itself contemptible. It was as if they felt they had the President on the run and were determined to ruin him no matter what the consequences might be for their country.

Was it too much to ask that the critics restrain themselves? If the critics are right, was a great deal to be lost by postponing their I-told-you-so comments until late November? We think not.

The men who fight the President, with the exception of Sen. Goodell, R-N.Y., are not honest enough to say that they want to "bug out" of the war, to use the expression popularized by the President. The Fulbrights, the Kennedys and the Harrises will not say openly that they favor a cut-and-run policy, but their recommendations would leave no other alternative.

Wednesday there is to be a day of protest against the war. If it were an honest expression of war weariness and an earnest plea for our leaders to find an honorable solution as quickly as possible, the whole of America could join in.

But its promoters have made it clear the Oct. 15 protest is no such thing. It is an attack on President Nixon and the handling of the war. Its timing and the nature of its sponsorship permit no other explanation. It is part of a new, intensive effort to destroy Nixon's prestige and give our enemies reason to believe that the American people are eager to surrender.

It cannot and should not be allowed to become a surrender day. It should be an affirmation day in which Americans show the President they are with him in his efforts to get us out of Vietnam honorably.

Vice President Agnew has proposed that Americans who stand with the President drive with lights on Oct. 15. It would also be an especially good day for flying the American flag.

#### BREAKING OF A PRESIDENT, PART 2

(By David S. Broder)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—If there are any smart literary agents around these days, one of them will copyright the title, "The Breaking of the President," for the next big series of best-selling nonfiction narratives.

It is becoming more obvious with every passing day that the men and the movement that broke Lyndon B. Johnson's authority in 1968 are out to break Richard M. Nixon in 1969.

The likelihood is great that they will succeed again. Breaking a president is, like most feats, easier to accomplish the second time around. Once learned, the techniques can readily be applied as often as desired—even when the circumstances seem less than propitious.

No matter that this President is pulling troops out of Vietnam, while the last one was sending them in; no matter that in 1969 the casualties and violence are declining, while in 1968 they were on the rise. Men have learned to break a president, and, like any discovery that imparts power to its possessors, the mere availability of this knowledge guarantees that it will be used.

The essentials of the technique are now so well understood that they can be applied with little waste motion.

First, the breakers arrogate to themselves a position of moral superiority. For that reason, a war that is unpopular, expensive and very probably unwise is labeled as immoral, indecent and intolerable.

Presidential critics who are indelicate enough to betray partisan motives are denounced (that for you, Fred Harris). Members of the president's own party who, for reasons perhaps unrelated to their own flagging political careers, catapult themselves into the front ranks of the opposition are greeted as heroes. (Hooray for Charley Goodell).

The students who would fight in the war are readily mobilized against it. Their teachers, as is their custom, hasten to adopt the students' views. (News item: the Harvard Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology last week called for immediate withdrawal from Vietnam.)

Next a New England election (the New Hampshire primary is best, but the Massachusetts Sixth District election will do as

well) surprisingly shows that peace is popular at the polls. The president's party sees defeat staring it in the face unless it repudiates him, and the Harris Poll promptly comes along to confirm his waning grip on public trust.

The chief executive, clearly panicky, resorts to false bravado and says he will never be moved by these protests and demonstrations, thus confirming the belief that he is too stubborn to repent and must be broken.

Then, dear friends, Sen. Fulbright and the Foreign Relations Committee move in to finish off the job.

This is no fiction, it worked before and it is working again. Vietnam is proving to be what Henry Kissinger once said he suspected it might be—one of those tragic, cursed messes that destroys any president who touches it.

That being the case, any president interested in saving his own skin would be well-advised to resign his responsibility for Vietnam and publicly transfer the assignment of ending the war to Congress or the Vietnam moratorium committee or anyone else who would like to volunteer.

But he cannot—and that is the point the protestors seem to overlook. Assume that they and the president are both right when they assert that the time has come to end this war. Assume that the protestors know better than the president how to do so—despite the conspicuous absence of specific alternatives to the president's policies in their current manifestos.

There is still a vital distinction, granting all this, to be made between the constitutionally-protected expression of dissent aimed at changing national policy and mass movements aimed at breaking the president by destroying his capacity to lead the nation or to represent it at the bargaining table.

The point is quite simple. Given the impotence in this country to be out of that miserable war, there is no great trick in using the Vietnam issue to break another president. But when you have broken the president, you have broken the one man who can negotiate the peace.

Hanoi will not sit down for secret talks with the Foreign Relations Committee, nor can the Vietnam moratorium sponsors order home a single G.I. or talk turkey to Gen. Thieu about reshaping his government. Only President Nixon can do that.

There is also the matter of time. It is one thing to break a president at the end of his term, as was done last year. It is quite another thing to break him at the beginning, as is being attempted now.

The orators who remind us that Nixon has been in office for nine months should remind themselves that he will remain there for 39 more months—unless, of course, they are willing to put their convictions to the test by moving to impeach him.

Is that not, really, the proper course, rather than destroying his capacity to lead while leaving him in office, rather than leaving the nation with a broken president at its head for three years?

Would not their cause and the country be better served by resort to the constitutional method of removing a president?

And what a wonderful chapter it would make for Volume 2 of "The Breaking of the President" series.

[From the Bellevue Press]

IT SERVED NO GOOD . . .

(By Jack L. Allen)

A former Bellevue High student, now in college, who used to spend many of his free hours debating current issues with me, has written that he is surprised that I haven't commented so far on the so-called moratorium yesterday.

While I agree that the time is nearing for an end to American involvement in Vietnam, I was, for what it's worth, totally opposed

to yesterday's activities by the anti-war forces.

President Nixon inherited the war. It is completely unreasonable to expect that he could, in ten months, undo what took years to create.

When Richard Nixon was inaugurated in January, America had long passed the point at which a so-called "victory" was feasible. It might be possible to bring the enemy to its knees through military power, but the President can judge the country and he knows that to try to do so, so late, would rip the United States apart and no efforts to solve America's domestic problems could survive the emotions over the war.

I think President Nixon has done everything possible to date, to encourage negotiated peace. He has made many concessions to the enemy, including our willingness to accept any type of Vietnam government decided in free elections, and has started withdrawing troops in the hopes that he can remove most of them within 12 to 15 months.

Yet he is attacked daily by those who offer no American alternative, except that we abandon our commitment to South Vietnam. To set a deadline for the final withdrawal of American forces would play into the hands of Hanoi.

We all want peace. We shouldn't be in Vietnam, but we are there and the problem is how to get out without losing South Vietnam to communist conquest. Because, after all, it has been to keep the Reds from conquering South Vietnam through force that thousands of young Americans have died.

The campus leftists who march and scream, who fly the enemy's flag from fraternity windows and drape college buildings with Red slogans, and their sympathizers in the clergy, communications and politics, make no contribution to the cause of peace.

They have the right to think what they may and say what they may, but they cannot bargain with the enemy at the conference table. Only the President can bargain for peace, and October 15 served no other purpose but to undermine his bargaining position.

If those who ignored their studies and jobs yesterday, really had America's best interests at heart, they would have marched in the streets to call the world's attention to the fact that every move by America toward peace has been rejected by the communist dictators in Hanoi.

But that doesn't seem to be on the minds of those who, through their actions, signal Hanoi that it should be patient while the "New Left" tries to force an American surrender in Vietnam, as the only way to bring peace to America's streets and campuses.

Yesterday's moratorium participants no doubt included many sincere persons, who consciences force them to oppose the war. But no one will ever convince me that those who organized it and gave it the publicity to build it out of proportion, are not, in fact, motivated by the desire to destroy the presidency of Richard Nixon.

They "tasted blood" in 1968 when they destroyed Lyndon Johnson and they want more blood.

But as someone else said the other day, America's foreign policy cannot be decided from day to day on the basis of what will or won't send the campus leftists into the streets. To do so would mean anarchy.

It is my belief that those who lead these demonstrations, those who seem to want anarchy, would demand peace and an American surrender even if Soviet troops were marching into Washington, D.C.

If America in the early 1940s had witnessed the spectacle of October 15, 1969, and Chicago, August of 1968, it is very possible that today we would be speaking Japanese and German.

## PROJECT SANGUINE

### HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I placed an article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD concerning Project Sanguine, the Navy-sponsored communications project scheduled for construction in 26 counties in northern Wisconsin, including some in my congressional district. Several other articles on this matter have recently been published, one in the New York Times, one in the Milwaukee Journal, and another in the Progressive magazine.

As these articles point out, this project would be the only one of its kind in the United States, and in case of nuclear attack could be used to communicate with Polaris submarines which may be cruising at 500 or 600 feet below the surface of the ocean.

A quick review of one of these articles may lead one to believe that this is a partisan matter. This is certainly not the case.

Whether or not to build Project Sanguine is at least, in part, an environmental issue. The Navy has indicated on numerous occasions, in fact, that environmental issues will definitely be considered before a final decision to complete the project is made.

Conservationists have given a great deal of study to Sanguine and they have expressed grave reservations as to what results it may have for the ecology of this vast area. There is great uneasiness about Sanguine on the part of many Wisconsin citizens, and legitimate questions about its needs, reliability, and consequences are being asked. I think these questions deserve answers, if need be, by an independent committee of ecological experts familiar with the area, by persons in the Department of the Interior or members of the President's Office of Science and Technology.

In discussions with my colleagues I have discovered that aside from a few notable exceptions, there are very few persons outside the State of Wisconsin who are aware of Project Sanguine or its implications. At this point I include in the RECORD the following articles:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 14, 1969]

#### CONTROVERSY AND ANTENNAS GROW IN WISCONSIN FORESTS

(By Anthony Ripley)

CLAM LAKE, Wis.—There is a strange and mighty visitor stirring in the vivid autumn woods four miles south of here.

It is the United States Navy and, depending on one's point of view, the Navy is going to turn the northern Wisconsin forests into either the world's biggest electric chair or a "world peace center."

These are the most emotional descriptions yet in a growing public debate over Project Sanguine, once such a highly classified matter that the Navy even stamped newspaper clipping on the subject "secret."

Beginning last fall and working through the winter, the Navy has installed one of the world's largest radio transmitters four miles south of Clam Lake, a settlement of

75 persons in the Chequamegon National Forest.

#### 2.4 MILLION WATTS

Two 14-mile-long antennas, crossing in the middle, stretch out along 30-foot swaths cut into the forest. The antennas hang from heavy-duty utility poles and are capable of sending a powerful, low-frequency radio signal around the world.

The average toaster operates at 1,000 watts and the largest commercial AM radio stations in the nation are limited to 50,000 watts. The Clam Lake transmitter can put out 2.4 million watts.

Such current thrown into the air electrifies metal objects nearby and can upset telephones, television and household lighting.

Ultrahigh frequencies can have physical effects on man, animals and plants. The Navy plans to use ultralow frequencies where little is known about side effects because such radio waves have been little more than a laboratory curiosity in the past.

#### ONE-WAY TRANSMITTER

But Navy spokesmen say this curiosity can be made into a one-way transmitter. Although incapable of sending a human voice, it can slowly transmit coded signals in the 40-cycle to 80-cycle range that are practically unjamable.

The spokesmen have indicated that "hot line" messages from the White House or Pentagon could order signals from such a transmitter to Polaris submarines that cruise the world's oceans with nuclear missiles. Because of the long wavelengths, the signals penetrate the ocean water to great depths and the submarines will not have to surface for instructions.

If four to six years of testing with single transmitters go well and the giant antennas do not cause too many electrical problems in the forests and homes nearby, the Navy plans to install a gigantic underground grid of cables and transmitter stations that could cover most of northern Wisconsin.

#### THREAT TO WILDLIFE

Those who regard Sanguine as "an electric chair" believe its tremendous size and currents will drive away game and fish electrifying everything in sight. And they think the project is an escalation of the arms race.

"World peace center" believers feel that the project will help guarantee peace through power, that the Navy can take care of any electrical problems and that the whole thing will help the region's depressed economy.

At Clam Lake, few are sure yet what the project means.

When the Office of Economic Opportunity opened a Job Corps center near Clam Lake, there was strong opposition initially. But the arguments died out when it was discovered that jobs and income were there for local residents. The Job Corps center is now closed.

Louis Hanson, a former State Democratic chairman, lives in Mellen, Wis., with his wife, Camilla, the former Mrs. Theodore C. Sorensen, and her three sons. He works as home assistant to Senator Gaylord Nelson, a Democrat, and thinks that Sanguine borders on insanity.

In July and August of 1968, when the Navy announced it, Senator Nelson began wondering when he had ever voted for such a project. Mr. Hanson said. "So he called an admiral and he came over with another man who had a briefcase shackled to his wrist."

"They opened the briefcase and it had newspaper articles in it stamped secret. That caused a little stir at the time. They don't do it anymore."

Mr. Hanson said the first appropriations had been voted in 1958 as part of a general Navy research and development program. Since then, at least \$28-million has been spent on the project.

Northern Wisconsin was chosen as the site because of an ancient rock formation, the Laurentian Shield, which is dry and noncon-



ductive, providing a base that will not cause heavy losses of current along the huge antennas.

The Laurentian Shield extends through 26 counties in Northern Wisconsin. Mr. Hanson said. These counties make up 41 per cent of the state and contain about a million persons.

He added that the final antenna grid might be as big 150 miles wide and 150 miles long, with 240 transmitters, and would cost from \$2-billion to \$10-billion.

The Navy maintains that there are no final figures on how big or costly the project might be because it is still in an early test phase. Although a number of conflicting figures have been published, they have no substance, according to John Hennessey, Public Congressional Affairs officer for the Naval electronic systems command in Washington.

The first Sanguine experiments were conducted on a mountaintop in 1962 in Southwestern Virginia and North Carolina. Mr. Hennessey said in an interview. The experiments caused some telephone and electric difficulties near Mount Airy, N.C., but the Navy said these were solved and the transmitter there was still in use.

Although confident that most of the electrical side effects in Wisconsin can be "mitigated," the Navy added a series of tests on plants and animals when protests grew. A study was ordered from Hazleton Laboratories, Inc., of Falls Church, Va., but it only added to the controversy.

In its proposal for the study, the laboratory noted:

"It has been shown that there can be pronounced effects on the longevity, body weight, growth, behavior, central nervous system, reproduction, etc., in animals as well as effects on plant development from ultra-high frequencies."

In the low frequency ranges, the proposal added, little work has been done although "there may be some effect on sperm production," according to a study done in 1967.

#### POSSIBLE EFFECTS

"The antenna will be enormous and, therefore, many people, domestic and farm animals, fish, insects, earthworms, birds and indigenous plant life will all be exposed to its fields for very long periods of time unless they are killed by it, are removed, or, in the case of free-ranging animals, are driven out by noxious effects. Of course, it may be that the fields will be totally benign."

Opposition has boiled up, mostly in the Democratic party and among conservationists.

A Stop Sanguine Committee has been organized by Kent D. Shiffert, a history instructor at Northland College in Ashland. The state Democratic party has passed a resolution arguing for more studies on environmental effects. Senator Nelson has branded the Hazleton study as "totally inadequate."

One of Sanguine's prime defenders has been Representative Alvin E. O'Konski, a Republican, whose district includes the Sanguine area.

When the Navy scheduled a meeting last July to explain things to Ashland County officials, the county's New Democratic Coalition urged the public to attend in a mocking advertisement in The Ashland Daily Press that read in part:

"Hear the genuine Navy captain talk about the world's biggest electric chair. Caution! Asking questions that embarrass the Navy may be unpatriotic."

The meeting was stormy but the Navy prevailed.

William R. Hayford of Camden, N.J., an engineer who is site manager at Clam Lake for the RCA Corporation, a major contractor, said the test facility was designed to answer all the questions raised.

"We've got to convince people we're not guessing," Mr. Hayford said.

"These people are asking honest and fair questions and they have to be answered and they will be and that's why we're here."

Mr. Hennessey, the Navy spokesman, said the final Sanguine system would have to be "survivable" after an atomic attack.

In military jargon, survivability is determined by four factors: dispersion (how widely it is spread out), redundancy (having a large number of similar installations), hardness (keeping it in a safe place, such as underground) and mobility.

Mr. Hennessey said Sanguine would meet three of the four requirements.

He described the project as an "adjunct" to existing communications systems and said it was not totally protected from enemy jamming. Any radio signal can be jammed by building a larger, more powerful transmitter and overwhelming the old signal.

Mr. Hennessey emphasized that the Navy was not going ahead with Sanguine unless all problems could be "mitigated."

"Either Sanguine is compatible with its environment or we don't build it," he said.

Last summer, in Park Falls, Wis., protesters put up a picture of an electric chair on a rented billboard with the legend, "Project Sanguine—Shocking, Isn't It?"

Within 24 hours the sign was smeared with paint and someone had written, "Go Navy."

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Oct. 12, 1969]

#### THE UNSEEN MACHINE

(By Harry Pease)

Sometime within the next decade the population of northern Wisconsin—people, deer, bear, fish, pine and popple—may begin living on top of the biggest radio antenna ever built by man.

Hundreds—more likely thousands—of miles of cable may be buried under some 20,000 square miles of field, forest and lake. Individual cables, which would be fed by underground transmitters, might be 5 to 50 miles apart. Their periphery might be 150 miles on a side and could embrace part or all of 26 counties.

The prospect is both exciting and disquieting.

Exciting because the system would open a new field of communication, a single source of signals which would spread around the world higher than airplanes fly and deeper than military submarines dive. Defense officials say it would increase the effectiveness of our nuclear weapons carriers in war and reduce the chance of an accidental attack in peacetime.

Disquieting because people, plants and animals would be exposed to an electrical environment different from any in which successive generations have heretofore been born and lived out their lives. This unseen machine would use 800 million watts of power, more than enough to serve half the households in Wisconsin.

Like many first steps in costly technology—radar, jet aircraft, nuclear power and space vehicles leap to mind—the giant radio station is a military concept. The navy, the service in charge, calls it Project Sanguine.

The name has no particular significance. It happened to be at the top of a preselected list of code designations when this effort was begun.

It has turned out to be apt, though. Sanguine can mean either "optimistic" or "bloody."

If the worst fears of conservationists and the direst predictions of antimilitarists prove true, Sanguine could upset the whole balance of life in the woods. If the navy's expectations turn out to be justified, few creatures—human or otherwise—will even know Sanguine is there.

Lots of misinformation has come into circulation since the program was publicly announced July 1, 1968. Whether it arose from

or gave rise to a rapidly developing controversy is not clear.

Few sensible decisions have ever been reached from wrong premises. Beginning on Capitol Hill, proceeding through the old navy building in Washington and several libraries, and winding up at a test site near Clam Lake in the Chequamegon national forest, I tried to trace out the accurate history, purpose and current status of Sanguine.

I encountered some surprises.

The navy, which wants to build the giant transmitter, has thought up a whole lot more possibly unpleasant consequences than has the fiercest opponent of the project.

Despite all the talk about a "secret communications facility," hardly anything that could affect Wisconsin is classified. Naval officials and their contractors decline to spell out how the signals would be used in military operations, but seem willing to tell all they know about the transmitter and antenna.

And, much as they want the service Sanguine could furnish, the navy men are remarkably hard nosed about protection of our north woods and its inhabitants.

"If Sanguine cannot be made compatible with its environment, Sanguine cannot be built," said John R. Hennessey, civilian public and congressional affairs officer for the naval electronic systems command.

At least six private contractors have been hired by the navy to investigate various kinds of hazards and ways they can be reduced. Another, the research institute of the Illinois Institute of Technology in Chicago, has been hired as a watchdog to make sure the first six do their work properly. Four government agencies in addition to the navy itself will be watching the watchdog.

"If anything, we could be faulted for wasting money on unnecessary research," said Martin Abromavage, an electrical engineer in the interference mitigation branch of Project Sanguine. "But we have to convince the public—and we're not all that confident that we know all there is to know about our frequencies."

The uncertainty is one reason why no operational Sanguine system has been designed. The navy has not asked for authority or money, and will not for several years, because it does not know what it will want to build.

It has been widely reported that "the" Sanguine system would consist of a grid of north-south and east-west cables six miles apart extending from Superior to Niagara and from Chippewa Falls to Oconto Falls. Two hundred forty transmitters would feed the antenna.

Thomas P. Quinn, director of field projects for the office of naval research, explained that this was a base line system—a crude concept drawn up as a guide so engineers could envision the kinds of tests that would have to be made and the general range of power that would be dealt with.

"It probably would work, but Sanguine will almost certainly not be built that way," he said.

Some time a couple of years from now, when testing is further advanced, the navy will get contract definitions—tentative designs—from several contractors who have expressed interest in bidding. The designs will be studied and their best features will be combined into one, for which construction contracts will be let if the department of defense and congress authorize the project and provide funds.

For the moment, no exact location can be stated nor can any reliable cost be estimated. Rep. Alvin E. O'Konski (R-Wis.) has guessed \$1.5 billions, which the navy says is probably too high.

Hennessey said an operational Sanguine system was at least four years away. When I asked where the electricity to operate it was coming from, he conceded that the navy would have to negotiate with some utility

for construction of a new generating plant—probably nuclear—and that lead time for the power plant itself would probably be four years after the navy made up its mind.

Sanguine has been a long time in gestation.

Its remote ancestors were German scientists during World War I. They had an idea for eavesdropping on telephone conversations between French commanders. Sappers wriggled out into no man's land and thrust electrodes into the ground, hoping to detect the current that leaked from French telephone lines.

It didn't work. All they heard was noise, which later was traced to distant lightning. Evaluating the failure, the experts noted a particularly strong resonance—an energy peak—at 7 cycles a second.

Decades later another German, W. O. Schumann, became interested in atmospheric physics, including the "broadcasts" from lightning. He came to a remarkable conclusion.

The ionosphere is an electrically charged upper air layer more than 100 miles thick. Schumann concluded that it and the surface of the earth formed a spherical resonant cavity in which very long radio waves would reinforce one another. The effect was most notable at 7 cycles a second, but could be seen at several frequencies below 100.

Schumann published his work, beginning in 1952. Other scientists took it up. The American office of naval research became interested in 1958.

Since then the navy has spent about \$28 million on extremely low frequency radio research. It has good reason to be interested.

Few Americans realize how tenuous are the communications through which our Polaris missile submarines get their orders.

The submarines stay under water for two months at a time. They can, and presumably do, run 600 feet beneath the surface routinely and dive somewhat deeper if necessary. But at these depths they are completely deaf to commands from their government.

To receive signals from any of the five existing low frequency radio transmitters they must rise virtually to periscope depth. Even there, they must tow long antenna wires through the water.

In a period of international tension a commander might be unwilling to expose his ship this way. Even if he did, his radio might be useless because of lightning, solar storm, intentional jamming by an enemy or atmospheric nuclear burst.

Military men read these facts as a weakness in our ability to retaliate, and therefore in our ability to scare an enemy out of starting a war. They avoid discussing the possibility that a misguided skipper, acting independently, could precipitate nuclear tragedy.

Radio signals in the Sanguine frequency range penetrate the oceans to depths perhaps as great as 1,500 feet. They are less subject to natural or man made interference, and can be received by antennas mounted on a submarine hull. Sanguine would permit positive control.

Any communications system which would meet the submarine's needs would also do for land, air and surface sea forces too. A single transmitter in the United States would end our dependence on cables, microwave links and higher frequency transmitters in some 75 countries around the globe.

To utilize those very long radio waves man would have to pay a price. He would need an enormous antenna, and it would be highly inefficient. One of the reasons the Sanguine system is so resistant to jamming was stated succinctly by Cdr. William K. Hartell, a SeaBee officer who manages the facilities engineering branch of the interference mitigation program.

"An enemy would have to build a Sanguine system of his own," Hartell said.

If the transmitting facility were in a par-

ticularly favored spot, designers could hope to radiate 150,000 watts of the 800 million watt power they fed the transmitter. Northern Wisconsin is the only such favored spot in the United States.

The power will be fed into cables in the order of 50 miles long, grounded at both ends. Tests are being run at about 500 volts, with 500 amperes of current flowing. Test frequencies are 45 and 75 cycles; an operational system would use one or more frequencies in between.

The return path for the current would be deep underground.

Bedrock in northern Wisconsin is the worn down remnant of a granite mountain range born some 2.5 billion years ago, a formation called the Laurentian shield.

The rock contains little water and few cracks, or faults. Electrons escaping the antenna would spread downward three to five miles, giving the effect of a giant loop. The series of loops which make up the entire grid must be fairly accurately aligned, and faults in the rock might skew them and reduce their effectiveness. Moisture in the bedrock would let the electrons get home at more shallow levels, partially collapsing the loops.

The Appalachians and the Rockies are made of the right kind of rock, but it is massively faulted and the surface slopes are so rugged that construction of a working Sanguine system would be costly if it were possible at all.

The navy made its first Sanguine tests with a cable strung on poles that followed an Appalachian ridge through southern Virginia and northern North Carolina.

That facility, built in 1962, proved that extremely low frequencies could be used for communications. Neither voice nor Morse code was practical, but a sort of computer language that could be interpreted by the proper kind of receiving machine was successful.

The antenna not only communicated. It rang telephones in the Mount Airy (N.C.) exchange whether anybody was calling or not. This was the navy's introduction to practical problems which arise from a fundamental law of physics.

If you end an electrical current through any conductor, electrical currents will be induced in nearby conductors. The induced voltage depends on distance from the primary, or antenna; length of the secondary, its angle to the primary (parallel gives the greatest voltage) and the conductivity of the earth.

One class of Sanguine problems stems from this effect.

Induced electricity could interfere with telephones, change the frequency of power transmission lines and upset such appliances as television sets and electric clocks, and charge fence lines, pipe lines and even the reinforcing rods in concrete highways.

All these difficulties can be overcome, the navy men think. They built a Wisconsin test facility to experiment with methods—neutralizing transformers, ground systems and simply clipping fence lines into shorter lengths connected by insulators.

Critics have declared that Sanguine would "charge every doorknob." The navy says this is untrue; an object must have considerable length to be affected appreciably. However, they expect that 1,000 feet of fence a mile from an antenna cable and parallel to it could pick up a 52 volt charge if no preventive action were taken.

The test antenna near Clam Lake is strung on 30 foot utility poles in the form of a plus sign with each of its four legs seven miles long. Ground wires add another seven miles to the total array. Make believe power lines and telephone cables have been strung at various distances out to 2,000 feet.

The transmitters which feed the wire will draw nearly three million watts of power from a commercial electric substation when

the facility is running full tilt. That will not happen before next spring.

"Our test instruments are so sensitive they would be saturated by the electrical field in a New York street," said William R. Hayford, of Camden, N.J., site manager for RCA, the navy's contractor.

The navy has been as careful not to despoil the forest esthetically as it is to avoid inducing voltages in the sparse and distant wiring. The cables have been trenched under main roads and streams used for recreation.

No messages ever will be sent from the Clam Lake facility. Its purpose is only to test interference and means of mitigating it.

Phase I testing, as the navy calls the Clam Lake activity, will continue through most of next year.

Other testing will go on concurrently.

Bell Telephone Laboratories has been engaged to study ways of mitigating telephone interference. RCA will do the same for power lines. The Batelle Memorial Institute in Columbus, Ohio, has been charged with finding out whether the proximity of the big antenna would speed corrosion of pipe lines.

The navy is negotiating a contract with Boeing to determine whether Sanguine would interfere in any way with aircraft communications or navigation.

Dr. William B. Kouwenhoven of Johns Hopkins university will make some fundamental studies of electric shock at Sanguine frequencies.

Using human test subjects he will determine how high a voltage must be to be sensed as a shock and how high it must be before the muscles contract and keep a person from letting go of a wire he has grasped. A part of the study will include the effects of wet clothing, cuts or abrasions on the skin which touches the conductor, and possible differences when people are dressed or gloved in various natural or synthetic fabrics.

Using dogs, he will determine how much of a shock is required to interfere with the action of both normal and abnormal hearts.

The navy says its goal will be to reduce the charge induced on every object within Sanguine's range below the level of perception.

Hazleton Laboratories in Falls Church, Va., will use techniques similar to those used in drug evaluation to test the effects of life in electrical and magnetic fields the size of Sanguine's.

Generation after generation of bacteria and fruit flies will be grown to see whether there is any effect on heredity. Cages and stalls have been fitted with coils and electrodes, and rats and cattle will be bred under Sanguine conditions—rats at least two generations.

Other tests will be run on onion plants, rabbits, turtles, bluegills, ducks, dogs, cats and possibly other animals and plants. Groups of animals will be tested without any electrical field, with a field equal to that expected directly above a Sanguine antenna cable, and at 10 times the Sanguine level.

The studies will include such factors as central nervous system function, blood and other biochemistry, reproduction, effects on cells of various organs and the like.

The Hazleton contract alone calls for \$173,000 initially and extension if any hint of adverse affect appears.

If all the Phase I tests and laboratory results are favorable, the navy will ask for funds to build Phase II, an underground cable and transmitter layout southeast of Park Falls. Still only a minimum experimental facility, it will take about two years to install and run through its planned test program.

I came away from my quick look at Project Sanguine with the feeling that protests are premature.

The navy is proceeding slowly, cautiously, conscientiously as far as I could see. Its



spokesmen admit candidly that science has not answered all the questions about Sanguine, and repeatedly declare that there will be no wiring of the woods until all the answers are in and all are adjudged favorable.

There will come a time, perhaps in two or three years, when the nation will want to look hard at the program as it would at any other major defense expenditure. Neither Wisconsin senator is favorably disposed now; there is no reason to believe that the sponsors of Sanguine will get it without hostile scrutiny.

On the other hand, there is no evidence that the navy plans to despoil our wilderness recreation area, harass our people and our wildlife or charge recklessly into an unexplored zone of technology.

In fact Wisconsin, the navy and United States of America all seem to be on the same side.

[From the Progressive magazine, October 1969]

# PROJECT SANGUINE—THE NAVY IN THE NORTH WOODS

(By Erwin Knoll)

A funny thing happened this summer in the area around Park Falls in northern Wisconsin. Local telephones suddenly went on the blink. Residents heard hums, buzzes, the crackle of static. It was a minor and momentary inconvenience—merely the latest bad break to befall Project Sanguine, the U.S. Navy's ambitious plan to turn a twenty-six-county area of Wisconsin into the world's largest radio transmitter.

Project Sanguine has had more than its share of bad breaks. Not major naval disasters, mind you, such as colliding with an Australian aircraft carrier or sinking a submarine at dockside or losing a spy ship to a third-rate power. Just little troubles that make for nasty little items in the newspapers—and items in the newspapers are precisely what the Navy had hoped to avoid in connection with Project Sanguine.

Only a year ago, in fact, Project Sanguine was a very hush-hush. The Navy hardly talked about it at all, and all documents pertaining to Sanguine were stamped "Secret." Among the documents so stamped were the newspaper clippings that started cropping up in the Wisconsin press as Phase I of Sanguine got under way in the Chequamegon National Forest. When word leaked out about the Pentagon's curious practice of applying the secrecy classification to published news reports, an embarrassed Defense Department memorandum set forth a new and radical policy—"articles appearing in newspapers, magazines, or elsewhere in the public domain will not be classified." To the Navy's dismay, that memo, too, made news.

The purpose of Project Sanguine is to provide the Navy with a transmitter powerful enough to send signals to ships and installations around the world, and particularly to Polaris missile submarines that may be cruising deep below the oceans' surface. Present communications methods, the Navy contends, are susceptible to interference by hostile powers or adverse weather conditions.

Sanguine would rely on the extra-low-frequency (ELF) range of the radio spectrum—waves that move along the earth's crust, immune to atmospheric disruption. The system does not lend itself to the transmission of sophisticated messages—but it would suffice to convey a simple coded command to attack, and perhaps even to designate a target.

To furnish the power and range the Navy seeks, the Sanguine system would require a vast tic-tac-toe grid of electric cables buried about six feet underground. The rolling terrain and subsurface rock formations of northern Wisconsin are said to be ideal for the purpose. If present tests prove the feasibility of the project, the Navy plans to install some 6,000 miles of cable under a 25,000 square mile area by the mid-1970s, at an ultimate cost of \$2 billion or more. About \$27

million has been spent so far in the testing phase.

The anonymous Defense Department mavericks in charge of Project Nomenclature—the folks who gave us such delights as "Safeguard" for the ABM system—hit the jackpot when it came to naming Project Sanguine. *Sanguine* is one of those wonderfully ambiguous words. It can mean *cheerful*. It can mean *bloody*. The first sense is undoubtedly the one the Navy had in mind. The second seems much more apt to many of those who are beginning to take a close and critical look at Project Sanguine.

"This new communication system will decrease our reliance on our foreign-based communication radio relay stations, and will help us in reducing our gold flow to foreign countries," says the narrator of "A New Voice in the North Woods," a cheery Navy propaganda film that has been given frequent showings in northern Wisconsin recently to help allay the growing uneasiness of residents in the Sanguine region.

It is an effective film, replete with stirring footage of Navy ships and planes in action, and it ends on this rousing note:

"This powerful military establishment exists *only* to insure peace and the security of the United States and our allies. The state and the people of Wisconsin are playing a key role in the development of this new worldwide command and control communication system.

"Your cooperation and continued support of this vital project is a significant contribution to our nation's security and its capability for maintaining the peace in this troubled world."

To some residents of the beautiful but chronically depressed north woods, Sanguine also promises to make a significant contribution to the local economy. An avid booster is Republican Representative Alvin E. O'Konski, who rushed the news of Project Sanguine to his constituents last year in terms that might more properly be reserved for the Second Coming. Local news stories inspired by O'Konski (and promptly stamped "Secret" by the Pentagon) predicted that Sanguine would provide the area with at least 5,000 new jobs—a figure that appears to have been exaggerated by about 2,500 per cent. In an unfortunate figure of speech, O'Konski also asserted that "I'll sleep well once I know the system is working."

Despite O'Konski's hosannas for Sanguine and the exertions of the Navy propagandists, Northern Wisconsin residents in growing numbers are voicing apprehensions about the project. The state's two Democratic Senators, William Proxmire and Gaylord A. Nelson, are receiving much mail reflecting concern about possible problems ranging from the trivial to the cosmic.

Will Sanguine's underground wires interfere with surface telephone, radio, and television reception? Will the electrification of a vast area endanger plant and animal life, disturb the ecology of the region, and perhaps even imperil human life? Will the installation make northern Wisconsin a prime nuclear target in the event of war? The Navy, while frequently invoking the secrecy requirements of "national security," has attempted to provide answers to these questions, but has failed to satisfy those who raise them.

In an early, pre-Wisconsin test of Project Sanguine several years ago, telephones for miles around a test site in South Carolina were set to constant ringing by a small grid of ELF transmission wires. The telephone interference experienced this summer in the Park Falls area occurred when a small "dummy load" of electricity was sent through some Sanguine lines. "The customers complained that they could not use their phones," said the district manager of the General Telephone Company, and an official of the Wisconsin Natural Resources Department reported that the state's conservation commu-

nications network had been temporarily put out of business.

The Navy's comment on such incidents is that every effort will be made to "mitigate" Sanguine's effect on civilian communications before the full-scale network is put into place. Dan Satran, the editor of the *Vilas County News-Review* in Eagle River, Wisconsin, wrote a few months ago:

"The thing that worries some of the North country folks is that the Navy authorities constantly and persistently stick to the term 'mitigate' rather than 'eliminate' and some know there is a world of difference between the two terms. Webster defines *mitigate* as 'causing to become less harsh or hostile—to make less severe or painful.'

"At its best, Project Sanguine's side effects may be only a little less painful—and at its worst the north woods of Wisconsin may turn up on a map in Moscow with a big red circle around Park Falls and the button at their control center may be connected to a missile that could be dispatched for a catastrophic landing in the Chequamegon National Forest."

Mrs. Camilla R. Hanson, the Democratic chairman of Ashland County, is convinced that "there is a very real danger that Northern Wisconsin would become a prime target for nuclear attack in the event that Sanguine is built." She conveyed her concern last spring to Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird who, as a former Wisconsin Congressman, is presumably well briefed on the details of Sanguine. Mrs. Hanson received a reply from Rear Admiral Francis J. Fitzpatrick, the Assistant Chief of Naval Operations, that left her far from reassured. "It is impossible," the Admiral wrote, "to prove that a Sanguine system would not be a prime target. However, one way of discouraging such an attack would be by constructing it to be so survivable that it would prove too costly and ineffective an effort for any enemy to make such an attack."

More imminent than the danger of retaliatory nuclear devastation is the possibility that Project Sanguine will drastically affect the balance of nature in northern Wisconsin. Lowell L. Klessig, a conservationist and environmental scientist at the University of Wisconsin's School of Natural Resources, points out that once the installation of Sanguine is completed, "the whole region will be bathed in low-frequency radio waves radiating from the transmitters." Klessig, who is attempting to mobilize opposition to Sanguine through "all legal means of political warfare," makes this case:

"Every biologist knows that the nervous system and other biological processes operate on the principle of internal electrical fields. To put an organism in an external electric field such as is proposed by the Navy in Sanguine may very well alter those biological processes. . . . Fish and earthworms are especially vulnerable since they live in the high conductivity media of water and ground. However, the electromagnetic fields may even influence the guidance system of migratory birds such as ducks and geese and cause them to lose or change their flyway patterns. Other animals might leave the area of intense stimulation or be destroyed by it."

Under a \$175,000 Navy contract, Hazleton Laboratories, Inc., of Falls Church, Virginia, is now attempting to analyze the "potential biological hazards" of Project Sanguine. Senator Nelson, who has consistently questioned the necessity and desirability of the Navy project, calls the Hazleton survey "inadequate in scope from the very beginning." His skepticism is based in part on such language as this in Hazleton's research proposal:

"The potential hazard from temperature increases associated with antenna elements, after power is on, will be investigated only to a limited extent, using plants. It is our opinion that such animals as groundhogs are not of sufficient economic value to be of concern."

"That kind of unconcerned arrogance is frightening," Nelson says.

Under the heading, "Responsiveness to Navy Direction," the Navy's instructions to the research laboratory contain this interesting paragraph:

"This task is not a grant to research topics in which individuals may be interested or competent. The task is intended to provide answers to questions posed by the U.S. Navy. In the course of the work, initial directions of study may prove fruitless and substantial changes may have to be made in the task. Evidence should be given that individuals assigned will subordinate their own interests and will take directions from Navy project managers who may have little knowledge of biological science." That doesn't leave much room for doubt about who will call the turn on Hazleton's research.

The Navy concedes that one side-effect of Project Sanguine will be the transmission of a "mild electric shock" through all metallic objects in the area. It plans to insulate all wire fences, metal guard rails, and other objects that might become unintended conductors of potentially hazardous currents. Farmers will be subjected to "unbelievable" complications when they put in new fencing or change a fence line, Nelson says.

"The most frightening thing, however," the Senator adds, "is what happens in the case of old, abandoned fence lines the Navy hasn't found because they are rusting away and half-buried in the forests. The chance of a hunter or a small child on a rainy day touching one of these unmitigated lines could bring a real tragedy."

In a recent response to a Wisconsin acquaintance who inquired about Sanguine's possible harmful effects on humans and wildlife, Secretary Laird wrote: "In any steps the Navy takes in implementing Project Sanguine, all possible consideration will be given to its effect on natural resources. At the same time, Defense Department responsibilities include investigating developments which may lead to an improvement in the defense posture of our country."

Curiously, the precise impact of Project Sanguine on the "defense posture of our country" has been the aspect last discussed, either in Wisconsin or in Washington. Yet this may be the most urgent reason for putting obstacles in Project Sanguine's path. Some analysts are privately suggesting that Sanguine, like the ABM and MIRV, is primarily not a defensive but an offensive device. They reason that the Navy's present communications system is quite adequate for the maintenance of a credible nuclear deterrent; even if only half the force of Polaris (or Poseidon) submarines were to receive the word, they could mount a more than adequate retaliatory second strike. The reason for the Navy's eagerness to go ahead with Sanguine, these experts suggest, is that the total communications system is essential to the mounting of a concerted first-strike attack.

There is no way, of course, of proving or disproving this thesis. It is merely plausible. And with the other problems, large and small, posed by Project Sanguine, it seems to constitute reason enough to keep the Navy out of the north woods.

our national space program. This editorial points out the importance of our industrial capability and our open program as being major contributors to the success of our national space program. The points raised in this editorial are of underlying importance to the future of our national space effort. This significant editorial does much to reinforce the importance of these ideas. The editorial follows:

#### APOLLO FOOTNOTES

They may not be the most obvious or the most important facets of the incredible story which has been written during the past week, but a couple of things ought to be asterisked and recorded in footnotes as the Columbia sails across the space sea from the distant shore its crew has visited.

One is that this first small step-giant leap away from the earth toward exploration of the universe, this triumphant achievement of a national goal set for America by its President eight years ago when it seemed impossibly out of reach, is a product of the technological sophistication and capability of modern industrial America's free enterprise system.

It is a product, in short, of the very thing which so many these days have seen fit to deride. "Military-industrial complex" has become an epithet. But the fact is that America's "military-industrial complex," which a quarter of a century ago in time of war saved the nation through quick mobilization of power to meet the threat of aggressors who thought the U.S. would be a pushover, once again rose to the peaceful challenge of space exploration.

It simply wouldn't have been possible without the know-how and the ingenuity and the superb performance of literally hundreds of thousands of individuals and companies who are the flesh and blood reality of the sinister "complex" about which we hear so much nonsense these days.

A second point is that the difference between the free, open American society and the closed, secrecy-shrouded society on the other side of the Iron Curtain was never more dramatically evident.

While every step, ever moment of the Apollo 11 mission, as of all America's previous missions, was open to public gaze, Russia's simultaneous Luna 15 mission, like previous Russian missions, went mysteriously along its path. The world will know only what the Russians choose to tell about it, when they choose to tell it.

Huge crowds thronged around television sets and radios around the world for reports on Apollo. They were eye-witnesses to spectacular success, and they would have been eye-witnesses if, God forbid, there were spectacular failures.

We believe that the open window, whatever the risks involved, has a greater impact—not only in the details of a specific mission but in the impression formed of the society which has confidence enough to open the shutters—which will not be lost upon the peoples of the world.

#### MORATORIUM—AN INQUIRY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the moratorium demonstration on October 15, 1969, is further evidence of the all-out war being waged against the people of the United States.

This activity was not a spontaneous reaction of the masses but the result of

general staff type of planning and vast financing for what in either World Wars I or II would have been dealt with as treason.

There are two questions that should be asked: Who were the planners? Who supplied the millions of dollars that the moratorium must have cost?

These questions must be answered if the agents for creating chaos and their financial supporters are to be identified and the people of the United States, their Government, and institutions protected against serious injury.

Several articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,  
Oct. 18, 1969]

#### MORATORIUM DEMONSTRATION AGAINST WAR BOOMERANGED

(By William S. White)

The central and the ironic reality in the wake of the much-advertised "moratorium" demonstration against the Vietnam war is that this attack upon President Nixon's position, and that of the mildly hawkish forces in general, has boomeranged.

The Vietnamese Communists on the one side and—of all people—Vice President Agnew on the other side broke the moratorium's back before it had really begun. That this is the plain fact will not of course ever be publicly conceded by those dove senators who had abetted what they had believed would be an irresistible spasm of emotional pressure upon the President to open a general retreat from Vietnam forthwith.

All the same, how the doves really estimate the situation in the after-time is clearly shown by their actions. For the only politicians who are now talking much about the great moratorium are the politicians who had opposed it in the first place. The doves, for their part, are beginning a slow process of disassociation—of "Who, me?" from the happening of Oct 15.

These fellows, when all is said and done, were out to get the President, and in this they have signally failed. It would go too far to say that he has wound up by getting them. It is, however, entirely true that he has come out of this affair in incomparably better shape than the most optimistic of his advisers had believed to be possible. Moreover, it is plain that many, many Americans are beginning to have second thoughts about this whole business of turning a vastly complex foreign-policy problem out into the public streets.

The bedrock reason for the President's relative success is that North Vietnamese Communist Premier Pham Van Dong made a colossal blunder in addressing a "Dear American Friends" open letter to the antiwar people in this country and Vice President Agnew brilliantly exploited an arrogant intrusion by an enemy engaged at that moment in killing American troops.

The prospective demonstrators on this side of the water were thrown into a panicky disarray. This was for the very good reason that the vast majority of them were fundamentally decent Americans, however deluded, to whom protest was one thing but open palship with an enemy dictator was quite another thing.

Indeed, in looking back on it all, the overwhelming reaction among many here—including very important persons in the White House—is one of amazement that Pham Van Dong could have made so incredible an error. Nobody in authority here had been prepared to condemn Mr. Day as a Communist-front operation; for, of course, it was not. Actually, many of those instant experts on foreign affairs who were in the streets—here in Washington, at any rate—were all of 14 years old and were quite as innocent of Communist connection as of simple, adult common sense.

Still, the fact remained, too, that home-

#### APOLLO FOOTNOTES

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as the Apollo 11 astronauts were returning home from their historic journey to the moon, the Birmingham News of July 22 examined several significant aspects of



grown Communists were indeed seeking to use the innocents; the problem for the administration was how to make this clear to the nation without seeming to be against "free dissent" and all that The Premier of North Vietnam most accommodatingly took care of the matter for the President, who then sent Agnew to the front to blast the thing from the White House steps.

Finally, the man who gained most of all was Spiro Agnew. For months poor Agnew had been the butt of condescension and ridicule, and if anything to his credit ever got to the public's attention, it was by accident. Indeed, he was strongly reminded of another Vice President called Harry Truman, who was also fashionably dismissed as a nonentity—and who, like Agnew, had the curious habit of saying just what he thought, to the pain and derision of the pseudo-sophisticates.

Today, there is a "new" Agnew. For it cannot be denied that he did quite a job here. So he is now, and for the first time, the second biggest man in Washington.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 18, 1969]

**NIXON, HUMPHREY SEE HASTY PULLOUT  
CREATING WORSE PROBLEM THAN WAR**  
(By John P. Roche)

On October 10, former Vice President Hubert Humphrey, at President Nixon's invitation, spent more than an hour in the Oval Office discussing the Vietnamese situation.

It was the first time that Mr. Nixon has opened up to his opponent of 1968 and it can be reliably reported that Mr. Humphrey was greatly impressed by the President's conviction and logic in setting forth the administration's program for ending the war. Indeed, at his own suggestion, Humphrey later went into the press lobby at the White House and urged nonpartisan support for Mr. Nixon's peacemaking efforts.

For this, he was promptly denounced by the "pull out overnight" wing of the Democratic party. However, in fairness to both Humphrey and the President it should be noted that a strong case can be made that such a pullout would create far greater problems for American society than does the war. On this point President Nixon was, according to well-informed sources, particularly persuasive in his session with Humphrey.

Both the President and Humphrey were senators in the early '50s and they share the memory of the impact that the fall of mainland China had on American politics. The same Americans who would have bellowed with rage in 1949 if massive military efforts had been made to preserve the Nationalist regime from the Communists, were surging around the countryside by 1952 looking for the traitors who "betrayed China to the Reds." And no Americans were killed in China.

The President reportedly is concerned that Vietnam could touch off a yahoo crusade that would make the work of the "China Lobby" of almost 20 years ago look like a political picnic. Forty thousand Americans have been killed, 200,000 wounded, perhaps \$100 billion spent in Vietnam, and the mood of the American people is obviously ugly.

If the President were prepared to accept a thinly camouflaged defeat and pull all our forces out some dark night, the first reaction would undoubtedly be a national sigh of relief. But then what?

Then, according to the same sources, Mr. Nixon anticipates a two-pronged public response. First, the revival of militant isolationism, a cutback in American commitments all the way from Southeast Asia to Berlin and Israel—in short, a retreat to "Fortress America." Second, a bitter quest for scapegoats that would be reinforced by the butchery which would accompany a Hanoi takeover in South Vietnam. (Some years ago Peking admitted quite casually that some 10 million Chinese had been liquidated

in the early years of its regime; on a smaller population base, Hanoi could be counted on to be similarly savage.)

The President's stubborn quest for an honorable peace is therefore based on his estimate that any alternative will both undermine the stabilizing role of the United States in the world—which in fundamental terms has maintained the peace since 1946—and generate a political lynching bee in American domestic politics. Moreover, he is said to be convinced that his program of "Vietnamization," coupled with staged withdrawals of American troops, will, in fact, work; that given another six months Hanoi will give up its present all-or-nothing gamble (in which American antiwar opinion is its hole card) and enter into genuine negotiations in Paris.

Although Humphrey was accused of being "brainwashed," any American politician (Democrat or Republican) who dismissed the President's forebodings as self-serving fantasies merits retirement. The easy thing for a liberal Democrat to do right now is to bask in the sunshine of antiwar militancy—the youngsters provide wonderful ego valet-service for those who feed their frenzy. Humphrey took the harder road. Although he clearly explained to the President his support for accelerated de-escalation and a cease-fire (as well as his absolute opposition to a rumored threat of hard-line action if negotiations continue to stall), he agreed that the administration is sincere in its search for peace and needs time. When he repeated this to the press, he demonstrated the kind of moral courage that other would-be Democratic Presidents would do well to emulate.

[From a paper by Comdr. M. C. Perry, U.S. Navy, read before the American Geographical and Statistical Society, at a meeting held March 6, 1856]

It requires no sage to predict events so strongly foreshadowed to us all: still "Westward" will "the course of empire take its way." But the last act of the drama is yet to be unfolded; and notwithstanding the reasoning of political empirics, Westward, Northward and Southward, to me it seems that the people of America will in some form or other, extend their dominion and their power, until they shall have brought within their mighty embrace multitudes of the Islands of the great Pacific, and placed the Saxon race upon the eastern shores of Asia. And I think too, that eastward and southward will her great rival in future aggrandizement (Russia) stretch forth her power to the coasts of China and Siam; and thus the Saxon and the Cossack will meet once more, in strife or in friendship, on another field. Will it be in friendship? I fear not! The antagonistic exponents of freedom and absolutism must thus meet at last, and then will be fought that mighty battle on which the world will look with breathless interest; for on its issue will depend the freedom or the slavery of the world—despotism or rational liberty must be the fate of civilized man. I think I see in the distance the giants that are growing up for that fierce and final encounter; in the progress of events that battle must sooner or later inevitably be fought.

**COMMERCIAL ENTERPRISES AND  
ASSOCIATIONS**

**HON. JAMES G. O'HARA**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I have been critical of a proposal by the Internal Revenue Service to assemble and publish income tax data by zip code area.

My contention has been that it will target areas of affluence for direct-mail advertisers and door-to-door salesmen.

A complete list of "commercial enterprises and associations" which have expressed an interest in this information will follow my remarks. I will deal in greater detail with several of the prospective clients in a moment.

Among the 14 "commercial enterprises and associations" at least half of them conduct direct-mail advertising campaigns. I was unable to get complete data on the business operations of the others.

Poore's Directory of Corporations lists the principal business of one of the firms, R. L. Polk & Co. as "Direct-mail advertising and the furnishing of mailing lists and specialized lists and mailing service."

Another potential purchaser of the IRS information is the Old American Insurance Co. Best's Insurance Reports says that this company has "developed a substantial direct mail solicitation on a nationwide basis."

Among the other potential purchasers are American Mail Associates and Names Unlimited.

For some years the IRS has published income statistics for the Nation's major metropolitan statistical areas. This year, by isolating major zip code groupings, it was able to publish this information for middle-sized cities.

Now the IRS plans to go even further by publishing income statistics for specific zip code areas, a geographical unit which can be measured in city blocks.

This would pinpoint neighborhoods in which direct-mail advertisers, and possibly door-to-door salesmen, would find their best sales prospects.

I strongly feel that this puts the IRS in the position of encouraging invasion of privacy. At the same time, it distorts the responsibility of the IRS.

I have written IRS Commissioner Randolph Thrower of my continued reservations about this project.

I recently received information from the IRS that it is reviewing this project. Presumably the IRS may cancel it.

However, I fear that the IRS will decide to pursue the project, thus inviting a deluge of direct-mail advertising down upon affluent or moderately affluent neighborhoods.

I hope that, as a result of this review, the Internal Revenue Service will conclude that it should drop plans to extend its statistical data publishing service and instead devote itself to its primary task, collecting taxes as efficiently and as fairly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, my letter to Commissioner Thrower and the list of prospective clients for the IRS zip code income tax data follows:

OCTOBER 15, 1969.

RANDOLPH A. THROWER,  
Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service,  
U.S. Treasury Department,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COMMISSIONER THROWER: I am in receipt of a letter dated September 19, 1969, from Mr. Albert W. Brisbin, Assistant Commissioner, Planning and Research, Internal Revenue Service.

Mr. Brisbin was responding to a letter which I wrote to you on July 7 in which I objected to IRS plans to make zip code area

income tax statistics available to commercial buyers.

At that time, I expressed the belief that this information would be invaluable to direct mail advertisers and door-to-door salesmen. I wrote that "I question whether it is the business of the Internal Revenue Service to draw targets for commercial interests who can proceed to invade the privacy of citizens who happen to live in moderate or relatively high income areas, as identified by the IRS statistics."

While declining to address himself in detail to my specific objections, Mr. Brisbin was kind enough to provide me with a list of potential commercial subscribers to the proposed new IRS statistical service. An examination of the list proves, I believe, that my fears were based on fact: that publication of the statistics will be of great help to direct mail advertisers. Evidence that it will also help door-to-door salesmen, is, I admit, inconclusive at this time.

It was not possible, because of lack of address and other pertinent information to discover the principal business interests of all the "Commercial Enterprises and Associations" which have expressed an interest in purchasing the IRS zip code data. However, virtually all of those which we were able to check on are involved in direct mail advertising.

The activities of such institutions as Sears, Roebuck and Co., Spiegle, Inc., Look Magazine and Time, Inc., are well known. It could be, of course, that these companies are interested in this data for market research, rather than direct-mail advertising purposes.

I would like to call your particular attention to two of the potential subscribers—R. L. Polk and Company and Old American Life Insurance.

Of the R. L. Polk and Co., Poore's Directory of Corporations says: "Principal business, publishing city directories, and bank directories; *Direct mail advertising*; statisticians for auto industry and other related subjects, *furnishes mailing lists and specialized lists and mailing services.*" (emphasis is mine)

Of the Old American Insurance Company, Best's Insurance Reports—Life/Health says: "Agency operations are conducted through branch offices in metropolitan centers with general agencies being used elsewhere. *In addition, the company has developed a substantial direct mail solicitation on a nationwide basis.*" (emphasis again mine)

Two other potential clients for the IRS service also aroused my interest, but because of lack of definitive information, I was unable to gather information on their activities. They are "Names Unlimited, Inc." and "American Mail Associates."

In his letter to me, Mr. Brisbin asserts that "Your assumption that this data will be valuable only to door-to-door salesmen and direct mail advertisers . . . completely misses the mark . . ." He adds that "The usefulness of this data for desirable public purposes is indicated by the list of subscribers who have written us requesting copies of the file in whole or in part."

Nowhere in my letter of July 7 did I say that the data would be valuable *only* to door-to-door salesmen and direct mail advertisers.

In fact, I prefaced my main points with the comment that I have no objection to the collection of information for legitimate government uses. I did say that I have serious reservations about the use of *tax data* by other governmental agencies. I note that some six governmental agencies, ranging from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Port of New York Authority, have also indicated an interest in the IRS information. I acknowledge that they may want this material for "desirable public purposes."

I recognize too that it would not be feasible to make this information available to governmental agencies while withholding it

from private enterprise. Therefore, I think it desirable for public agencies to get their income statistics from sources other than the Internal Revenue Service.

But as for commercial users, which outnumber governmental agencies 2-1, it remains my contention that the majority of commercial users of the zip code area data plan to utilize the statistical information for direct mail advertising purposes.

Can you tell me which of those Commercial Enterprises and Associations which have expressed an interest in purchasing the IRS zip code area data actually plan to use it for purposes *other* than direct mail advertising?

I still say that it would be relatively simple—if more expensive—for these businesses to do their own income research. The avalanche of direct mail advertising directed at certain neighborhoods would be the same, perhaps, but at least the Internal Revenue Service—the nation's tax collector—would not be a party to it.

I note with some encouragement Mr. Brisbin's report that "the question of publishing the zip code data is under review" by the IRS.

I hope that this review concludes that the Internal Revenue Service should drop plans to extend its statistical data publishing service and instead devote itself to its primary task—collecting taxes as efficiently and as fairly as possible.

Very truly yours,

JAMES G. O'HARA,  
Member of Congress.

P.S.—I would appreciate having the business addresses of the various Commercial Enterprises and Associations which have indicated a desire to buy the Zip Code Area Data. And will you please keep me informed as additional business firms express an interest in the information.

#### LISTS OF SUBSCRIBERS OF IRS ZIP CODE TAX DATA

##### GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

U.S. Department of Commerce, Office of Business Economics.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Tennessee Valley Authority.

Department of the Army, Office of Civil Defense.

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.  
Port of New York Authority.

##### NONPROFIT RESEARCH ORGANIZATIONS

National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.

The Urban Institute.

##### COMMERCIAL ENTERPRISES AND ASSOCIATIONS

American Mail Associates, Inc.

Associated Merchandising Corporation.

Data Use and Access Laboratories.

F K and S Marketing Consultants.

Look Magazine.

Names Unlimited, Inc.

Sears, Roebuck & Co.

Larry Smith and Company.

Spiegel, Inc.

Time, Inc.

Albert R. Young Associates.

Old American Life Insurance.

R. L. Polk and Company.

Hart Schaffner & Marx.

#### THE VIETNAM WAR

#### HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, since he took office, President Nixon has taken significant steps toward ending the American involvement in this war. He has reduced the number of American troops

there, and promises to reduce them still more. In this course, I believe, he has the strong support of the American people. In spite of his unfortunate statement about paying no attention whatever to the moratorium, he has paid attention to the views of participants—indeed, he has implemented much of what the war critics were clamoring for a year ago.

The President is right in ignoring the chorus of demands to "bug out" of this conflict immediately, and totally. He is trying to keep to a statesmanlike approach, so that we may gain at least some of the goals that we had when we entered this conflict.

His aim, expressed both by him and by administration spokesmen, is twofold: First, to extricate the United States from this war and, second, and equally important, is to do it in such a way as to encourage the stability and confidence of the other nations in the area in their future national security.

Vital to this second goal is leaving behind a strong, unified regime in South Vietnam, representing most of the vital and dynamic political groupings in that nation. This is our goal: up to now it would appear that it has not been sufficiently shared by the Thieu-Ky regime.

That is why it is so important that we continue our pullout. For as long as the Saigon government thinks we are going to stay and support them, they have less reason to change. Hopefully, when it is clear to them that in a limited time they will have to stand up on their own, they will take the steps that must be taken to broaden and unify their nation's government.

If the Thieu regime accepts the twin responsibilities of Vietnamization and democratization, then we hopefully can leave Vietnam, secure in the knowledge that we have won our goals.

And the government we leave behind will be one that can stand on its own, rather than be propped up by American bayonets. Our leaving under such circumstances will accomplish the second part of President Nixon's twin goals—it will leave the rest of Southeast Asia with a sense that the United States is not abandoning the area in flight, but in an orderly fashion, leaving behind a regime that could stand on its own.

The great danger, however—and I am confident that the President is aware of it, and will continue to try and avoid it—is that, in our aiming to leave in the most orderly manner possible, and to foster the greatest possible sense of security and stability in the area, we will lose sight of the first goal, disengagement.

And that is as the President realizes, an equally important goal. For it will do us no good to foster a sense of security and unity and confidence in Southeast Asia, if we lose it at home. Under our system of government, the majority rules—and it is clear that the majority wants our involvement in Vietnam to end. So it must end, and it will. But it is the President's hope—and my own—that it can end in a manner that will leave Southeast Asia with a sense of stability, security, and confidence in the American word and in the American presence. If it does not—and it would not if we withdrew im-



mediately and totally—then the deaths and expense there would truly have been in vain.

# MARK 50TH YEAR IN BUFFALO OF GENERAL ELECTRIC PLANT

**HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a half century of operation in the Buffalo area was marked this past weekend by the General Electric plant, located at the corner of Fillmore and Ferry Streets in my district in Buffalo, N.Y.

It was an honor and a pleasure for me to be a participant in the anniversary program and then to make a tour of the installation with the acting plant manager, William S. Munday, as my escort.

There was a special plaque presentation to mark the occasion, with two of the plant's original employees, now pensioners, Agnes Berchou and Anna Kurtz, doing the honors of receiving the memorial from Vice President Halbert Miller.

The Buffalo plant's role in industrial development of our Nation is almost a history of the half century. Started as a plant to make lamps, the production turned to cathode ray tubes, to television picture tubes, and then switching into semiconductor products, including germanium transistors, low current rectifiers, silicon unijunctions, and tunnel diodes.

## RELATIONS IN COMMUNITY

In his presentation, Mr. Miller noted the fine relationship of the plant to the community, commenting:

We are all proud of the fine relationship between the people and the plant . . . this is my third visit here. . . I could feel the support and pride of the employees as members of this organization.

Other GE officials attending were Dr. Leonard Maier, vice president and general manager; James Donnalley, SPD general manager; George Finch, SPD manager of manufacturing; and Robert Beck, newly appointed Buffalo plant manager.

Following the plaque presentation, a reception was held. A group of employees selected from all work areas in the plant also attended the reception.

These employees were Geraldine Sopczky, Mildred Przybyl, Rose Pijacki, Dolores Wagner, Bernice Maston, Carol Carter, Florence Budzynski, Bonnie Wozniak, Wanda Rozek, Eddie Kwiecinski, Virginia Wroblewski, Norbert Lotz, Tim Regan, Don Petrillo, Chet Malach, George Deiboldt, Mary Louise Wickett, Jim Hall, Florence Strzelecki, Cassie Winnicki, Dan Millick, Mildred Hill, Irene Laudan, Jane Paske, Bessie Albert, and Jerry Batt.

On the following day, the plant had a family day open house which was attended by more than 2,500 persons.

Following is an interesting history of the Buffalo GE plant:

## BUFFALO PLANT HISTORY

The General Electric Company's transistor plant is located in the heart of the City of

Buffalo. Manufactured here are high quality semiconductors, such as transistors and rectifiers for use in business, industry, missiles, military guidance systems, communications systems and other electronic control equipment, just to list a few applications. Still other transistors are shipped to manufacturers of such consumer products as electronic organs, home radios, and even educational model kits and toys.

The Buffalo Plant is proud of its product and proud of the skilled men and women who have been building high quality General Electric products in this Plant since 1919. The Plant was designed and built by the Company's Lamp Department to manufacture miniature incandescent lamps. A "Mazda Lamp" sign was located on top of the building and was a familiar land mark around the neighborhood for nearly a quarter of a century.

Many of the current employees started their careers with General Electric in those early years and have remained loyal employees ever since. Today they, and their sons and daughters, cousins, aunts and uncles are employees working on semiconductors. More than 107 employees have served General Electric for 25 years or more, nearly one employee in every three has 15 or more years of service and 50 per cent of the employees have at least 10 years of service.

Following nearly a quarter of a century of successful lamp production, the Plant switched over to the manufacture of electronic tubes in 1942 as part of the Company's war effort. Following the war, General Electric's Cathode Ray Tube Department started the manufacture of television picture tubes. The first TV picture tube manufactured on a production basis by General Electric came off the assembly line in January, 1946.

## SEMICONDUCTOR PRODUCTS START

Then in 1957, the Semiconductor Products Department established a satellite manufacturing plant in Buffalo and began producing transistors in the Spring of that year. A series of interior improvements have gradually turned the Plant into the modern, ultra-clean facility needed to successfully manufacture transistors. The main three-floor building facing Fillmore Avenue, as well as a two-story addition built in the early 1950's, was completely renovated during the early 1960's.

The Buffalo manufacturing facility is one of General Electric's 280 facilities in the United States and Canada. Located in over 135 communities in 33 states, Canada, and Puerto Rico, General Electric is the world's largest electrical manufacturer. The Company employs over 400,000 people to manufacture more than 200,000 different products. More than 29,000 employees hold degrees in engineering or the physical sciences. They work and study on product development in over 100 laboratory locations. More than 40,000 patents have been issued to the Company since the Company was founded in 1892, the highest number ever awarded to any one company.

The Buffalo Plant is proud of the General Electric Heritage and proud of the record of achievement which it has helped to forge over the years. Today, as the 50th Anniversary is celebrated, employees look forward to greater strengths and achievements in the days and years to come.

## SIGNIFICANT DATES IN BUFFALO PLANT HISTORY

1918: Plant construction begins by Lamp Department.

1919: July 1st—Official Dedication.

1919: Production of lamps commences.

1932-36: Closed during depression.

1942: Cathode Ray Tube Department begins operation producing special electronic tubes.

1946: 1st TV picture tube produced.

1950: One Millionth TV picture tube produced August 16th.

1957: Semiconductor Products Department

begins operations. Manufacture of germanium transistors.

1965: Low current rectifiers start production.

1966: Silicon unijunctions begin production.

1969: Tunnel diode production begins.

1969: 50th Anniversary celebrated.

## PUBLIC BROADCASTING FACILITIES GRANT PROGRAM

**HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the House passed almost unanimously, H.R. 7737, the Educational Television and Radio Amendments of 1969 on October 9. This act originated in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am the ranking member.

There is one particular section I would like to refer to and that is the public broadcasting facilities grant program. Until recently my State of Maryland did not participate in this program.

However, October 5 marked the official inaugural program of WMPB—UHF, Channel 67—with an interview of our Governor, the Honorable Marvin Mandel. Maryland has become the 47th State to enter the public broadcast service.

Mr. Speaker, I insert an article that appeared in the Washington, D.C., Star on October 5 pertaining to the official inauguration of this service:

PUBLIC TV CHANNEL 67 MAKING DEBUT AT 6 P.M.

(By Jack Kneese)

OWINGS MILLS, Md.—If you are the sort who becomes angry enough to smash a television set over insipid commercials, you may welcome a public television channel making its Baltimore-Washington debut at 6 o'clock tonight.

The official inaugural program of WMPB (UHF Channel 67) begins with an interview of Gov. Marvin Mandel by David Frost, an English performer, before a studio audience of 400 invited guests.

Maryland's venture into public broadcasting will not have a single commercial. Funded by federal, state and private money, the station is the culmination of efforts begun in the mid-1960s to bring educational TV to Maryland.

But its staff says WMPB is not strictly an educational type operation, although that is a basic part of its goal.

## WON'T DODGE ISSUES

Dr. Frederick Breitenfeld Jr., executive director of the Maryland Center for Public Broadcasting, said, "We aren't going to be non-controversial."

Breitenfeld said the new channel—one of seven to be established under the direction of the center in Maryland—will tackle any subject from sex education to fascism.

"We will be left, right, center. We'll try to present a fair picture," he said. "We won't have editorials or take sides, but we'll serve a public need."

## MORE STATIONS PLANNED

Maryland's Legislature passed enabling legislation for the center in 1966 and the center's \$1.25 million modernistic headquarters north of Baltimore was recently completed.

The next station to be begun by the center will be in Salisbury, scheduled for completion late next year. Others will be in Hagerstown, Annapolis, Frederick, Waldorf and Cumberland.

Although there are educational TV stations in 47 other states, the staff of WMPB feels that it is different in many respects. Its programming, said its staffers, will be daringly innovative.

One such example, they said, is the program, "Urban 30." This dramatic series is designed to act out problems of the inner city in a way that inner city residents can see how such problems can be solved.

Most daytime viewing will be aimed at the classroom, although much of it on a sophisticated level. There will be classes in lip reading, German language plays with pamphlet texts furnished to German scholars, chess, speed reading and many other subjects on more routine academic topics.

The station will not attempt to compete with regular commercial stations on news coverage. Typically, its staffers will single out a big news story of the day and attempt to analyze its ramifications in-depth.

About those commercials: just so viewers will not be too lost without them, WMPB is initiating what it calls "Hmph! spots."

This is a tidbit of history, technology or interesting facts read at usual station break time. The idea, said staffers, is to cause a viewer to say, "Hmph! I didn't know that."

#### PLAN NATIONAL HOOKUP

The station will hook into the National Educational Television Network for some of its programming, but it will do this less than most ETV stations.

One major series of programs planned for the station and its million-watt transmitter—powerful enough to reach into Delaware, Pennsylvania and Northern Virginia—is a series on Maryland's history.

The title of this series, written by Helen Jean Burns, head writer for the center, is "Nightmare's Child." It depicts the story of one family who sought refuge in the new colony from the oppressive rule of Oliver Cromwell. It is the first of 30 such telecasts written, acted and directed by center personnel.

The 50,000 square foot center has three studios, all fully equipped for color broadcasting. One of them, 60 by 80 feet, is the largest TV studio in the state.

#### AUCTION IS PLANNED

The center's budget for the current year is \$2.48 million but it will depend in the future on a heavy public contribution. Just how heavy, officials declined to say, but other stations have solved this problem, oddly enough, with auctions.

Televised auctions of merchandise donated by local merchants raised about \$500,000 in Boston. Callers simply bid by telephone on items they like.

A byproduct of the auctions, said center officials, is that viewer interest runs so high during an auction week that even local commercial TV is momentarily abandoned. An auction by WMPB is planned for next April.

An invaluable service of WMPB, said officials, is the education of adults unable to attend adult education courses in person.

"We'll have a vast hidden audience," Breitenfeld said of the adult viewers, many of them middle-age persons who need help in learning such basics as reading.

#### SEEK MEMBERSHIP FEE

The addition of Channel 67, and the planned addition of Channel 20 in the Baltimore area via a repeater set up in Towson, makes the Baltimore-Washington corridor the most TV saturated area in the U.S., said center officials. Some viewers situated between the two metropolitan areas can now choose between 14 stations, they said.

But WMPB is one of the few on the Eastern seaboard asking its viewers to send \$10 for an annual membership, tax deductible, in order to help its financial situation.

William F. Hallstead, director of community services for the center, recently an-

nounced that over 500 memberships have been received—even before WMPB went on the air.

#### MORALE IS HIGH

Hallstead said there is a kind of missionary elan among the 120 employees of the center. Many of them left the restrictions and daily deference to sponsors, he said, to come to the center, where salaries are just a shade lower than with commercial television.

One of the refreshing things about WMPB, said its staff, is that it does not have to worry about offending a sponsor or maintaining a certain kind of audience for a sponsor.

And the new station offers another plus, noted staffers: its kiddie programs are "guaranteed to drive no one up the wall."

This might be the best news of all—especially to those parents awakened on Saturday morning by that other kind of television . . . the kind with commercials rather than Hmph! spots.

### DEATH OF SAMUEL DALSIMER IS A NATIONAL LOSS

#### HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of Samuel Dalsimer, national chairman of the Anti-Defamation League, shocked many of us, who knew him for his dedication to the public welfare, for his integrity, and for his sensitivity to human needs. From the ADL Bulletin of October 1969 comes a true estimate of this man's worth and I believe that it merits the attention of all. The text of the article follows:

"Words don't mean a thing unless you follow up with well-programmed action," Samuel Dalsimer said last April when we interviewed him shortly after he was elected national chairman of the Anti-Defamation League.

On August 22, two days after he had suffered a heart attack and stroke, Samuel Dalsimer was dead at the age of 60.

The ADL Bulletin, four months before, had described him as "a tall, slim, young 60." We used words like quiet, sincere, and warm, and said he had "the mien of a friendly doctor who has known the family for years—and cares about each member."

The suddenness of his passing was met with shock and disbelief by "the family" outside his real family who knew and cared for Samuel Dalsimer—his many friends; his colleagues at Grey Advertising, where he had been vice chairman of the board, and those at the Anti-Defamation League, lay leadership, administrators and staff.

More than 500 attended his funeral. Benjamin R. Epstein, the League's national director, delivered the eulogy. This is what he said:

"Half a dozen years ago Adlai Stevenson received the Anti-Defamation League's America's Democratic Legacy medallion. As he responded, Sam Dalsimer—seated nearby at the head table—nodded his agreement with Stevenson's advice on how to live a good life and what makes a man. These were Adlai Stevenson's words:

"Go placidly amid the noise and the haste, and remember what peace there may be in silence. As far as possible without surrender be on good terms with all persons. Speak your truth quietly and clearly; and listen to others.

"You are a child of the universe no less

than the trees and the stars; you have a right to be here.

"Therefore be at peace with God whatever you conceive Him to be, and whatever your labors and aspirations, in the noisy confusion of life keep peace with your soul. With all its sham, drudgery and broken dreams, it is still a beautiful world. Be careful. Strive to be happy."

Sam did not really need those words—they were already his philosophy of life.

It has been said that each man's life is a mosaic and the beauty of the design is measured by the way in which the tiles fit into one another.

Sam's professional life was a richly colored segment. At Grey Advertising Agency, where he spent the last sixteen years of his life, he was loved and respected by all with whom he worked. He was the one person in the agency who was contemporary with the older as well as the younger members of the staff. The young turned to him because they knew they could trust him to be sympathetic, to be fair and to plead their case. He was unusual in that he was the confidant, the counselor for the entire agency, because he was fair and objective.

At Grey, where he was vice-chairman of the board and a director, he was the man to whom all public service roles of the agency were given. He coordinated and supervised programs in which the government and the Advertising Council were involved. He served on the Mayor's Committee to develop a program to combat crime.

Through his position at Grey he was involved in a number of minority group programs, including one for high school dropouts who work for Grey half a day and attend classes in English, math and speech in the agency's offices the other half.

Communal obligations which Sam assumed formed another part of the mosaic. His activities included the Jewish Family Service, the Advertising Council, the camps of the Associated YM-YWHA's of Greater New York, of which he was a trustee, and the Anti-Defamation League.

It was Judge Meier Steinbrink, then national chairman of the League, who first interested Sam in its work. Meier had come to know Sam through the close friendship he shared with the Steinbrink children, Miriam and Stuart. It was with the League that he found the opportunity to express in meaningful terms his dedication to fairness, to the struggle for religious and racial harmony, to the fight against anti-Semitism, racism, and every form of bigotry. He served as a member and vice-chairman of the League's Eastern regional board and was elected a national commissioner in 1959. For 12 important years he was the chairman of the League's national program committee, which developed a major educational program in the struggle against bigotry under his capable leadership. He was among the first to see the need for scientific research into the causes of anti-Semitism and he fathered a major five-year social research project at the Survey Research Center at the University of California at Berkeley.

There were hundreds of projects to which he lent his thoughtful direction, but one that was closest to his heart was the Cardinal Bea Memorial program of closed-circuit television programs entitled "The Image of the Jews," jointly produced by ADL and the Archdiocese of New York.

I'll never forget the luncheon where I told him the ADL nominating committee had decided to recommend him for election as national chairman. He said, "Oh, Ben, why me? I'm not looking for anything like that; I'm enjoying my work with the program committee." He then told me of his plan to retire at 60; to take things easy, and to do those things he loved so much. He wanted more time to pursue his interest in Haiti, an interest which developed through collecting



Haitian stamps. He had found expression in painting. He was enrolled in courses in cultural anthropology and the masterpieces of art. He wanted more time to garden, more time for his photography, more time to enjoy his home at Neponsit—and above all, more time for his family: his beloved wife, Shirley; his sons Jimmy and Andy; the daughters who came to him through his children's marriages, and his lovely grandchildren.

He was flattered by our desire for him to serve as national chairman. I told him we understood he was not seeking the job, the job was seeking him. A week later, Dore Schary and I met with him again and assured him that he would have our full support and cooperation, that he could make a great contribution to a significant cause, that he would enjoy the opportunity to guide this agency in this vital work. He agreed to consider it. I know he discussed it with Shirley, who encouraged him to do what he loved—and he telephoned Dore to say—"Let's go to work."

In the months he served as chairman he steeped himself in the work. He studied each of our divisions, spending hours with the staff directors and then would come to my office with his loose-leaf notebook and sit down and say, "Ben, I have so many questions I must talk to you about." He was the most thorough and best organized man I've ever worked with—and all with a deep sense of commitment, a remarkable sense of balance and proportion, and a perception and analysis that were beautiful to behold.

To capsule the life of a man is not easy. Sam was a unique man. I have never heard anyone say an unkind word about him. It reflected his own attitude to his fellowman. He was warm, gentle, softspoken, with an unusual gift of humor. Rarely did he raise his voice in anger. On those few occasions when he did raise his voice it was to protest an injustice, or to defend someone unfairly treated.

If there is one word to characterize Sam it is fairness—he had a deep sense of fairness, he could empathize with people and understand their problems.

And so, Sam was deeply committed to the cause of justice. He resented deeply the injustices of bigotry and particularly anti-Semitism. He did not believe in formalized religion, but he was a deeply intense and committed Jew. He was a proud American Jew and devoted his life to enhancing the dignity and prestige of the American Jew.

As a personality he had a warmth and a friendly manner that endeared him to all with whom he came into contact. His face would light up as it broke into a smile. And he smiled easily and often. He was a sophisticated man—he was a man of grace and charm and style and wit.

One of his special talents was his facility to write poetry. He was an early contributor to the *NEW YORKER* magazine and Franklin P. Adams published many of his poems in his famous column, "The Conning Tower."

Many of you may have read these poems without knowing Sam was the author, for in his typically humorous fashion he signed them REMISLAD—Dalsimer spelled backward. He entertained his friends by writing poems about them and would come to a party with a poem describing, in light verse, each of their special qualities.

We have spoken about Sam, but let Sam speak for himself, through two of his more serious poems. The first is called "Writer's Prayer":

"Dear Lord, please give me sight to see the sheer  
And narrow road that Reason walks—the sweet,  
Unbending path she talks on certain feet,  
And let the rightness of each step be clear.  
And if it please You so, I ask an ear  
To trap the faint but ever-present beat.

Of Truth's own heart; the skill to plot the neat,  
Appointed course each word should steer.

"And then, when I have looked with knowing eyes  
Along the cool and shaded avenue

Of logic; and my ears have learned to prize  
The word that inescapably is true,  
Then, let my heart infuse both word and thought,  
That out of these a living thing be wrought."

The second poem, "Now, Tomorrow," is in a prophetic vein. It is almost as if he had written it so that he might share it with us on this day:

"What cruel fate has crushed the first fine flame  
That burned uncaring at the candle's end?

When once it glowed with radiance to shame  
Us cautious souls, who stay at home to mend

The shabby fabric of our faith against  
That day when we shall put it on and walk  
Abroad—now all at once it has commenced  
To fade; the bud is dying on the stalk.

"You'd never shun today and look a bit  
Along the years. With simple faith somehow

You held your flame and never cared for it  
Would die, as long as it burned brightly, now.

I hope the flame that's dimmed did not depart.  
But burns for some tomorrow in your heart."

And so today we remember Sam Dalsimer as a man of heart, a man of conviction, a man of honor, a man of love, a man of charm and modesty, an optimistic man, a devoted family man. In short, Samuel Dalsimer was a beautiful man.

#### EMPHASIS: SAFETY

### HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Mr. J. M. Durham, corporate director of safety of the Martin Marietta Corp., recently wrote an article entitled "Emphasis: Safety" for the August issue of *National Safety News*. I was delighted to learn that Martin Marietta, which has a plant in Baltimore County, has had a markedly better safety record than in previous years as a result of emphasis on accident and injury prevention. I would like to commend Martin Marietta for its interest in industrial safety by including Mr. Durham's article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### EMPHASIS: SAFETY

(By J. M. Durham)

When the injury loss statistics continue to climb, what do we do? This was the question posed to a group of safety leaders at the recent National Safety Council Industrial Conference meeting in Chicago. Preliminary injury frequency rates for all injury reporters for 1968 showed another increase from 1967—the fourth consecutive year of ascending rates—for a total increase of 20 per cent in five years!

The Martin Marietta Corporation experienced a comparable rise from 1964 through 1967, as shown in the accompanying comparison Table, but obtained a sharp reversal

of the upward injury trend after initiation of a special campaign.

In addition to the increase in frequency rate during the 1965-67 period, there was a sharp increase in the corporation's severity rate during 1967 and early 1968, and an increase in fire losses and vehicle mishaps. Although the injury rates could still be considered acceptable when compared to national statistics, they seemed to be unnecessarily high and led the corporate staff to question what could be done to reverse the upward trend.

Martin Marietta operations consist of rather diverse activities: aerospace; production of Portland cement, lime, and refractories; the building and erection of farm silos; processing of crushed stone, sand, and gravel; the manufacture of dyestuffs, printing inks, and chemicals. The divisions operate autonomously in 300 plant and office locations with 28,000 employees under only general direction from the New York corporate offices. Loss prevention is controlled by these individual divisions, most of which have safety engineers. A small corporate safety staff monitors and coordinates their efforts.

Already, accident prevention staffs had been expanded in several divisions. The usual defenses of good guarding and physical facilities, supervisor and employee courses, formation of committees, and the institution of safety meetings and five-minute talks had been pushed. There seemed to be little additional potential in these areas. Existing promotional materials from private and quasi-public sources had been used in varying degree at the discretion of local safety directors and plant managers.

MARTIN MARIETTA VERSUS THE FIELD—INJURY FREQUENCY RATES FOR ALL NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL REPORTERS COMPARED TO THOSE OF THE MARTIN MARIETTA CORP., 1964-69

Year	Rate of NSC reporters	Rate of Martin Marietta
1964	6.45	2.80
1965	6.53	3.30
1966	6.91	3.45
1967	7.22	3.48
1968	17.35	2.72
1969 (5 months)	(2)	2.64

<sup>1</sup> Preliminary.  
<sup>2</sup> Not available.

Inasmuch as the losses frequently involved imprudent actions on the part of the injured or his co-worker, failure to follow established regulations and procedures, and seeming inattention, the director of safety recommended the adoption of a one-year corporate accident prevention publicity and promotion campaign aimed at better safety communication with management, reminder information for employees, and the achievement of better safety cooperation of everyone. The request was approved, and a publications group in one of the divisions was selected to edit, illustrate, print, and distribute the materials.

Beginning in late May 1968, the program was introduced under the by-line of *Emphasis '68*. It was endorsed by the president and executive vice-president of the corporation. Each of the group presidents at corporate headquarters participated in presenting and endorsing the plan to division presidents. The division presidents were asked to have meetings with their staffs as the next step, and so on down the supervisory channels to the first level supervisor or foreman.

At the beginning, it was planned that all employees of the corporation would see or receive some special material—a poster, a pamphlet, or a newsletter twice a month. Later, the period between distribution was lengthened to three or four weeks.

It was emphasized that these materials were intended only as tools to facilitate communication by supervisors with their employees and would be virtually useless if handled on an impersonal, mass distribution basis. Most materials were the same, whether used in a scientific research area or in a stone quarry. They dealt with the psychological and motivational aspects of safety, with little regard for engineering and physical safeguards, because those were believed to be generally adequate and also too diverse to handle in this manner. This effort was aimed at revitalizing the application by management personnel of what they already knew about preventing accidents.

What happened?

No one can give specific reasons, but in 12 months there was a 22 per cent reduction in the injury frequency rate and a 27 per cent reduction in the injury severity rate, compared with the previous 12-month period. This is interpreted as a definite break from the escalating trend that had been experienced. As this promotion was the only change made in the safety program, it apparently revitalized safety attitudes throughout the corporation. The cost of time and materials for creation, printing, and distribution was approximately \$1.20 per employee. The monetary savings can't be calculated, however, because insurance loss reports aren't complete, but the saving is expected to be at least \$100,000 in direct injury costs for the 12 months of the promotion.

Some of the techniques applied in the program are summarized below for the benefit of those contemplating similar ventures.

(1) Produced "in-house," the promotional materials were tailored to the specific needs of Martin Marietta, based on plant visits by the corporate safety staff, suggestions from safety directors and plant managers, and periodic reviews of such statistics as "sources of injury" and "types of activities resulting in disabilities." Supervisory and employee newsletters, prepared individually for each

of the four basic divisions, were the principal media for providing specialized information. Promotional activities by individual plants were encouraged, and the corporation-wide program appeared to serve as a catalyst in obtaining increased enthusiasm in this area.

(2) "Total participation" was emphasized—that is, involvement by everyone from top management to those performing the most routine duties. The distribution of materials to employees by supervisors on a personal basis or in meetings provided supervisors with an opportunity to highlight local problems and solutions. Increased employee participation was obtained by a) initiating suggestion systems in plants that had not used this technique and b) by having employees sign safety pledge cards. Distribution of materials was monitored by division safety directors. The influence that renewed emphasis on loss prevention had on the morale and effectiveness of these safetypros cannot be fully evaluated, but it should not be underestimated.

(3) The need for attracting the attention and arousing the interest of employees, who are regularly subjected to sophisticated promotional efforts by the mass communications media, was recognized. Accordingly, graphics, color, and human interest approaches were widely applied. The tone of text material was based on the theory that "preaching is dead—facts and news are alive."

(4) A "change of pace" was considered essential to maintaining effectiveness of the program. This was accomplished by alternating the media used. The beginning of 1969 saw increased use of Martin Marietta statistics, case histories, and discussion of specific areas where the record was not as satisfactory as that for the average of National Safety Council members. In 1969 a reduction in the severity rate was established as a major goal, and emphasis placed on preventing the more serious accidents.

The promotional program gave accident

prevention a boost by increasing attention and interest at all levels of the organization without detracting from any of the accident prevention methods already in use. It seemed inevitable that an improvement would result, but the quick benefits favorably impressed even its originators. To date, injury and severity rates are still on a downward trend. However, the staff, fully aware that any special program is effective usually for only a limited time, is now thinking about what procedure to follow next.

#### NATIONAL BUSINESS WOMEN'S WEEK

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 20, 1969

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged today to join my colleagues in saluting the working women of America.

This is National Business Women's Week and offers an opportunity for all of us to pay tribute to the millions of business and professional women of this country and to salute the contributions and achievements that they have made to the Nation and to their communities.

The task of running this country is a partnership—a partnership between government and the private sector, a partnership between labor and business, a partnership between black and white; and, it is a partnership between the men and women of America.

There are accomplishments posted by men and accomplishments posted by women, but they are first, accomplishments by Americans.